In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful

Transcription of the Course: Masā'il al-Īmān (Issues of Faith)

By Sheikh Dr. Hānī al-Sibā'ī

Al-Taḥāyā Foundation

Department of Transcription and Publishing

Adapted into English by Febby Angga

Proofread and reviewed by [….]

The First Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allah; we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allah from the evils of our own souls and from our bad deeds. Whomever Allah guides, there is no one to misguide him, and whomever He leads astray, there is no guide for him. I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, alone with no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed:

Honored brothers, here we are on the first day of this Sharia course, meaning the first lesson. Today is the fourth of the month of Dhūl-Qa‘dah, in the year one thousand four hundred and thirty-two of the blessed Prophetic Hijrah.

The Subject of this Course:

It is a scholarly Sharia course for anyone who wants to build his creed (*‘aqīdah*), or rebuild the creedal structure he has learned, or has not learned. This is a course for beginners who wish to organize their information and structure their creedal foundation.

This course is titled: *Masā’il fī al-Īmān* (Issues Regarding Faith). I chose important issues concerning the subject of faith. I did not wish to explain, for example, the book *Al-‘Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah*, or a detailed book of creed. However, I chose this subject for a reason, especially since it has a practical aspect in addition to the creedal aspect.

The problem with Muslims is that they learn only the theoretical structure; meaning, one learns the Names and Attributes, and learns some principles of creed. This is a good thing. However, from a practical perspective, or the practical return of this theoretical creedal structure, you hardly find this application existing in reality.

Therefore, I chose this subject, which is *Masā’il fī al-Īmān* (Issues Regarding Faith); meaning, the most important issues that every Muslim should know. These are famous issues among *Ahl al-Sunnah* and among other sects that differed with *Ahl al-Sunnah* regarding the issue of faith.

And what we will speak about is as follows:

First: The Plan of this Study:

The plan of this study is that I will proceed from the writings of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, who died in the year seven hundred and

twenty-eight Hijri. He has the famous book *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*. Included in this book is a book named *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* (The Major Faith) and *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ* (The Middle Faith). You will find these books printed separately in libraries.

Before Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, very many books were written. *In shā' Allāh*, next week I will give you some excerpts from these books as well. However, Ibn Taymiyyah is distinguished by the fact that he was able, in the eighth Hijri century, to refine the *madhhab* (school of thought) of the *Salaf*; because the *madhhab* of the *Salaf* in that period had been hijacked. People thought that the prevailing *madhhab* at that time, which was the *madhhab* of the *Ash'āriyyah*, was the Salafi *madhhab*. Matters became confused due to the similarity of many issues between *Ahl al-Sunnah* and the *Ash'āriyyah*.

So Ibn Taymiyyah was able in this book of his, meaning the book *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* and *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ*, (and *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* does not mean that faith is "big" and faith is "middle," but rather it is based on the size of the book); his book *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* was authored first because he was being asked questions and would elaborate. So he explained the famous Hadith of Jibrīl, which speaks about the levels of the religion: "This is Jibrīl who came to you to teach you your religion."

This book is originally an explanation of the Hadith of Jibrīl, but in the method of Ibn Taymiyyah. This is a merit and a flaw at the same time, for those who do not know the method of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah. You read Ibn Taymiyyah and sometimes you get lost. Why? Because he digresses a lot and branches out extensively, for he is like an encyclopedia. When he speaks, he elaborates, then returns to the issue after fifty pages, or returns to the answer after many pages as well! Thus, you feel a need for intense concentration, especially in the books of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah and his student Ibn al-Qayyim. This is their method in detailing and presenting issues with enjoyment. You enjoy it, but the beginning student of knowledge will get very tired. He will say: "Is this what Shaykhul-Islām said now? Or after fifty pages? Or twenty pages?" He returns to his opinion once again! This is the problem for some people.

Sometimes, when you review an issue and do not understand the method of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, you think that a certain opinion is Ibn Taymiyyah's opinion, then you find that it is not his opinion, but rather he is refuting it.

Frankly, there is no one in the Islamic world who was able to write on the issue of faith with such elaboration as Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah. All people are dependent upon the books of Shaykhul-Islām

Ibn Taymiyyah, especially his two books *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* and *Al-Awsaṭ*, then came the people after him. However, before Ibn Taymiyyah, yes [there were others]. He relied on *Kitāb al-Īmān* by Al-Ājurrī in his book *Al-Sharī‘ah*, and he relied on the books of faith by Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal in his *Masā’il*, and he relied on the book of Imam Al-Marwazī, and he relied on Imam Abū Isḥāq al-Isfarāyīnī, and he relied on Abū Bakr al-Ismā‘īlī, and Ibn Baṭṭah, and Abū Nu‘aym in *Al-Īmān*, and others. He relied on very many books. All of these [scholars] wrote on the issues of faith, and I will mention to you the most important books on faith.

Because books on faith are [usually] within general books of creed, like *Al-‘Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah*. The issue of faith is taken as a section. When Imam Ibn Abī al-‘Izz al-Ḥanafī explains the specific issue regarding the definition of faith, he elaborates there, and the commentators come. But this is an issue inside the book *Al-‘Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah*. As for the books that specialized in faith and refuting the innovators at that time, they are many and available; some are printed and some are manuscripts.

I warn once again: take caution with the books of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah. This does not mean negation of praise; rather, he is praised by this negation [of ease], because it is difficult like a forest. You must enter here and there and enjoy it, but you must be careful while reading.

Now I will give you an example: One of the young men was impressed by Ibn al-Qayyim and read his works. He authored a research paper and showed it to me, saying: "I wrote a research paper on an issue in *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* (Principles of Jurisprudence)." He told me: "I want to publish this on the Internet in the forums." I knew that he was new to commitment (religious practice) and knowledge; he is not one who has gone through experiences to write, and when he writes, he writes in *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*! Write in any other branch, such as admonitions and things like that; but to write in *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*! I said: "Good and blessing, mā shā’ Allāh." I read the research with which he challenged people and said he would publish, etc. Upon reading it, I found errors in the Arabic language right from the title; regarding grammar, speak without restriction [meaning there were many errors].

From the start: the subject (*fā‘il*) and object (*maf‘ūl*), the adjective and the noun described... everything you can imagine of the Arabic language was strange to him, as if it did not know him and he did not know it.

One got tired from the abundance of corrections—and he had shown it to me after correction. Then, regarding the content, where is the research? What is the subject? You say: *Al-Maṣāliḥ al-Mursalah*

(Unrestricted Public Interests). "I will research *Al-Maṣāliḥ al-Mursalah*," etc., and you go and bring a book. Is this scientific research? You must address a partial sub-issue in *Al-Maṣāliḥ al-Mursalah*: *Al-Maṣāliḥ al-Mursalah* according to this person, or according to Imam Mālik, and why so-and-so did not accept it while so-and-so did. You take a specific part and its relationship to another. It is not just issues like this. If so, mā shā' Allāh, just copy what is in the books and the matter is finished.

This is what our friend did. However, he came presenting opinions, so he presented an opinion of Ibn al-Qayyim. He said: "And I prefer the opinion of Ibn al-Qayyim on this issue." As I was reading the opinion of Ibn al-Qayyim, I said to him: "You said this is Ibn al-Qayyim's opinion?" He said: "Yes, and I support Ibn al-Qayyim's opinion." I said: "Then Ibn al-Qayyim has deceived you, or you were deceived, or you are lost! This opinion is the one Ibn al-Qayyim is refuting; Ibn al-Qayyim is actually against this opinion!" I told him: "This is because you do not know the keys to the sciences nor the keys to the personalities of the scholars. Ibn al-Qayyim reviews [opinions], but sometimes he proceeds at length in the refutation, and sometimes you find him stating his opinion after thirty or forty pages! Look in *I'lām al-Muwaqqi'īn*, you will find it there." He said: "I brought it from *I'lām al-Muwaqqi'īn*." I told him: "This is intuitively against Ibn al-Qayyim's opinion."

So he, poor soul, was not patient. I said to him: "O brother, you want to become a raisin before you become a sour grape (*ḥiṣrim*)!" Meaning, he wants to reach the stage of being a raisin. He wants to jump and be a raisin, which is a beautiful thing, before passing through the stage of *ḥiṣrimah* (sourness), in which it is like something dry. Thus, it passes through stages. He is rushing knowledge.

So, do not rush in [seeking] knowledge so that you do not get lost in the forest of scholars; scholars have methods in knowledge. Therefore, I warn the brothers: when you learn an issue, learn and be patient, then be patient and build another issue upon it. Do not expand like this, saying "I am authoring [a book]: I, praise be to Allah, listened to a lecture; so now I will research the issues of faith by Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim," and enter into the subject. Here, one must be cautious regarding these issues.

The Importance of this Study:

I chose the issues of faith (*masā'il al-īmān*) because they are very important for any Muslim; because upon them depends the classification of people into believer and disbeliever, and upon them depend Paradise and Hellfire. This is the gravity of this subject.

Secondly: You may hear about the sects (*firaq*) existing now; they all love Islam, and they all want Islam, so why did they differ? What is the secret of the difference? And what is the cause of the difference? And why did it reach the point where this one says that one is a disbeliever, and this one is a believer, and this one is in between? Why does this one declare that one a disbeliever (*yukaffir*)? And this one says he is a believer? What is the secret behind these problems? What is the origin of this dispute? We will speak about this, *in shā' Allāh*.

Topics of the Study:

- **First:** We will speak about the categories of people during the era of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, and we will speak after that about the ruling of an important category of people, to which people do not pay much attention, which is the category of the hypocrites (*al-munāfiqīn*); we will speak about hypocrisy (*al-nifāq*).
- Then we will speak after that about the appellation (definition) of faith (*musammā al-īmān*); the difference of *Ahl al-Sunnah* with the sects regarding the appellation of faith, the difference of *Ahl al-Qiblah* regarding the appellation of faith. This is the problematic cause. We will refute the doubts raised by every group.
- We will give you examples of the Islamic sects; such as the *Ash'āriyyah*, the *Jahmiyyah*, the *Karrāmiyyah*, the *Khawārij*, the *Mu'tazilah*; the divisions of these major sects. The difference between the *Ash'āriyyah* and the *Māturīdiyyah*, and what is the dispute between them? They are [both considered] Ash'aris, yet despite that, they differ.
- We will also speak, within these important issues, about issues raised by *Ahl al-Sunnah* which might entail a subsidiary matter; such as the issue: "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*" (Exception in Faith). The scholars differed regarding this, even within *Ahl al-Sunnah*. There are preferences and opinions in it. This is an important topic of research; we will speak about it as well. They raised it, but it is not of the same importance as the major differences regarding the appellation of faith.
- We will speak about the ruling on the perpetrator of a major sin (*murtakib al-kabīrah*), and the difference between *Ahl al-Sunnah* and others, such as the *Khawārij*, the *Mu'tazilah*, and others from the *Ash'āriyyah* and so forth, regarding the ruling on the perpetrator

of a major sin. We will derive very many issues from that which have ramifications.

- Then after that, I will try to conclude with something important regarding faith; what is the summary of this faith according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*? What are its conditions? What are its nullifiers? What are the problems that a Muslim should be aware of when studying the issue of faith?
- Since we will also speak, *in shā' Allāh*, about the levels of the religion, and the levels of the religion are found in the famous Hadith of Jibrīl: about Islam, *Īmān* (Faith), and *Iḥsān* (Excellence). We will start with it, then enter into the subject of the difference regarding the appellation of faith.

These are the important issues, and during the lesson, we will branch out into many sub-issues.

Knowledge requires patience:

وَتَوَاصَوْا بِالْحَقِّ وَتَوَاصَوْا بِالصَّبْرِ

"And advised each other to truth and advised each other to patience." [QS. Al-'Aṣr: 3]

Knowledge requires patience; so the brother who studies should not think that we will speak about an admonition with which we tickle emotions. You want to learn your religion, so you must be patient with this knowledge. Believe me, he who is patient will benefit greatly, and at the end of this course, he will praise Allah, *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā*, that he attended this course and benefited from it at the very least. Therefore, regarding those who attend, everyone must, if he is able, write down some notes or review them from the recordings.

We will hold an exam at the end of the course, *in shā' Allāh*, and mostly I prefer the oral exam so that I can test you and ask you, did you comprehend or did you not comprehend what I say. This is what happened, and for that, I thank the non-Arab brothers, *jazāhumullāhu khayran*, who do not speak the Arabic language. They have preceded you, and you are the people of the Arabic language, in this course, although it was in the English language. English is naturally difficult for me because it is not the mother tongue; despite that, I struggled with them until, by the grace of Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā*, I finished this course. They comprehended it well, and I held an exam for them; and praise be to Allah, I gave them an *Ijāzah* (license/certification) in this subject via an oral exam. Each one took at least a third of an hour, twenty minutes, until I knew that he

comprehended. We gave them certificates of appreciation, and [the student] was granted an *Ijāzah* in a Sharia course named *Masā'il fī al-Īmān*; and [it means] that he can now crawl in knowledge, and he is able to read and increase, and he can teach this material to others, if he has the aptitude. This is the meaning of this *Ijāzah*; I authorize you that you are successful in comprehending the difference in the issues, and it means that you are fit to teach others, or give a lesson to others, or explain it in any way. But my advice is that you learn more and read more, and so on.

The Books We Rely On:

The basis consists of the two books of Ibn Taymiyyah: *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* and *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ*. However, there are books we will try to use, helpful in this subject; especially the books of Ibn al-Qayyim, the books of Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī, and also books by the famous scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. I will give you a brief overview of some important books on faith that spoke about such issues.

Naturally, everyone speaks in a different method than the other; but Ibn Taymiyyah *raḥimahullāh* is distinguished by having been able to refine the *madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

From the most important books on Faith:

- The books *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* and *Al-Awsaṭ* by Ibn Taymiyyah.
- The book *Mu'taqad Ahl al-Sunnah* by Imam Al-Lālakā'ī, who is an Imam who died in the year 418 AH.
- The book *Al-Sharī'ah* by Imam Al-Ājurrī; he was refuting the Qadariyyah in it, but he also spoke about the famous issues of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. He died in the year 360 AH.
- The book *Al-Ibānah* by Imam Abū 'Abdillāh ibn Baṭṭah, who died in the year 387 AH.
- And there is the book *Al-Ḥujjah fī Bayān al-Maḥajjah*.
- And a book by Abū al-Qāsim al-Aṣbahānī, who died in the year 535 AH.
- There are other books related to this subject, such as the Book of Faith (*Kitāb al-Īmān*) in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.
- The book *Al-Īmān* by Ibn Abī Shaybah.
- *Al-'Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah*, as I told you.
- The book *Lum'at al-I'tiqād* by Ibn Qudāmah.

- The book *Ma'ārij al-Qabūl*, especially in the second part related to faith. He followed and summarized the words of Ibn Taymiyyah; therefore, it is easy because it was written in contemporary language.
- There are also ancient books; the book *Al-Sunnah* by Abū Bakr al-Khallāl, who died in the year 311 AH.
- There are books related to these issues by Ibn Taymiyyah; such as the book *Al-'Aqīdah al-Wāsiṭiyyah*, *Al-Ḥamawiyyah*, *Al-Tadmuriyyah*, and *Al-Aṣfahāniyyah*, but they relate to other issues like refuting the grave-worshippers and others, although they contain issues on Names and Attributes and things like this.
- There are other books that spoke on faith in a good manner, such as the encyclopedia of the books of the scholars of the Najdi Da'wah, *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah*.
- There is also a simple summary book named *Kitāb al-Īmān* by Ibn Mandah.
- And the book *Al-Durr al-Naḍīd fī Ikhlāṣ Kalimat al-Tawḥīd* by Al-Shawkānī.
- And the book *Al-Shifā'* by Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ.

So all these books have a relation to these issues. But the strongest of these books, as I told you, is *Kitāb al-Īmān* by Ibn Taymiyyah, which comprises the book *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* and the book *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ*. The two books are similar; why? Because he explains the Hadith of Jibrīl in *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr*, but he expands on refuting the sects, and refutes those called the rationalists and the people of innovation. So the book *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ* is a summary; meaning, he sometimes abbreviates some issues and expands on some issues, but the two books are like one book.

Books related to explaining the Sects:

- The book *Al-Fiṣal* by Ibn Ḥazm, who died in the year 456 AH.
- The book *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* by Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, who died in the year 429 AH.
- The book *Minhāj al-Sunnah*; when he spoke about Imamate (*Imāmah*) and Faith (*Īmān*), and he spoke on refuting the *Rāfiḍah* as well.
- There are books that speak about sects but from the perspective of general information; like the book *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* by Imam

Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī, who died in the year 324 AH. There are very many books, I will point them out later.

Categories of People in the Era of the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*:

The first issue we will speak about is the issue of the categories of people in the era of the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. People in the era of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* in the Meccan period were of two categories, and in the Medinan period, they were of three categories.

In the Meccan period: They were either a Muslim or a disbeliever; a Muslim outwardly and a believer inwardly, and a disbeliever outwardly and a disbeliever inwardly. Meaning, there was no hypocrisy; because the Muslims were weak, so this third category did not exist.

So, regarding the third category: when they migrated to Medina, and they had a state, and they had status, power, and authority, a third category appeared, and they are the hypocrites (*al-munāfiqūn*). Hypocrisy appeared in Medina; because the hypocrite displays Islam and conceals disbelief. He displays Islam due to the strength of Islam; he is a disbeliever in Islam, but because he is cowardly and fears to declare [his disbelief] openly, he pretends to be Muslim, announces the *Shahādatayn* (two testimonies of faith), and adheres to the outward teachings of Islam; he goes to the mosque and performs the prayers.

The Qur'an described them in:

وَلَا يَأْتُونَ الصَّلَاةَ إِلَّا وَهُمْ كُسَالَى

"And they do not come to prayer except while they are lazy." [QS. At-Tawbah: 54]

وَلَا يَذْكُرُونَ اللَّهَ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا

"And they do not remember Allah except a little." [QS. An-Nisā’: 142]

مُذَبْذَبِينَ بَيْنَ ذَٰلِكَ لَا إِلَىٰ هَٰؤُلَاءِ وَلَا إِلَىٰ هَٰؤُلَاءِ

"Wavering between them, [belonging] neither to the reasoning of those nor to those." [QS. An-Nisā’: 143]

This third category, the hypocrites, appeared in Medina. Therefore, you will find that there is a direct correlation between the increase in the

strength of Islam and the increase of the hypocrite in adherence to outward Islam. Meaning, the stronger Islam was, the more the hypocrite adhered to the outward teachings of Islam; because he fears to declare [disbelief].

However:

وَلَتَعْرِفَنَّهُمْ فِي لَحْنِ الْقَوْلِ

"And you would surely know them by the tone of [their] speech." [QS. Muḥammad: 30]

So he cannot declare it. But when Islam weakened, hypocrisy appeared [openly], an inverse relationship after that; hypocrisy appears because he declares it.

Like ʻAbdullāh ibn Ubayy ibn Salūl; he used to adhere to the teachings of Islam, and they were a large number, more than three hundred, or more than four hundred as it was said. These hypocrites in the era of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ʻalayhi wa sallam*, like ʻAbdullāh ibn Ubayy ibn Salūl, the head of hypocrisy, used to adhere to the outward rituals of Islam, and he used to go with them to the mosque, even though they knew he was a hypocrite through signs; he would equivocate with words and evade legal rulings.

Therefore, when he spoke and said:

لَئِن رَّجَعْنَا إِلَى الْمَدِينَةِ لَيُخْرِجَنَّ الْأَعَزُّ مِنْهَا الْأَذَلَّ

"If we return to Al-Madinah, the more honored [for power] will surely expel therefrom the more humble." [QS. Al-Munāfiqūn: 8]

The Companion Zayd ibn Arqam heard him, and he was a young boy, so he went and reported it, saying that he [Ibn Ubayy] was saying this and was insinuating against the Messenger, claiming that he [the Messenger] was the humble one and he [Ibn Ubayy] was the mighty one in Medina. Thus, this statement in itself is disbelief (*kufr*). Despite that, when he was brought to the Messenger, he denied it. Later, the Qur'an declared him a liar. Despite this, he committed many machinations; even in the incident of the *Ifk* (the Slander), he was fueling the feelings of the people in Medina. This is what is called the "fifth column."

Therefore, when our master ʻUmar said: "Let me strike the neck of this hypocrite," the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ʻalayhi wa sallam* said: "No, lest it be said —or lest the Arabs say— that Muḥammad kills his companions."

The Messenger did not fear carrying out the *Ḥadd* (prescribed punishment) or the ruling on him, but because there was no clear, explicit

proof [for the public]. This was information possessed by the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, but the people did not know. So they might think that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* kills his companions, because he [Ibn Ubayy] was among those who accompanied the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*; he was a hypocrite, but people viewed him as a Muslim because they did not know these issues.

So, had this hypocrite declared it openly, he would have established the *Ḥadd* upon him, but he used to evade. This is the danger of hypocrisy.

Thus, the categories of people in the era of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, in general, were thus: (Believer, Disbeliever, Hypocrite).

The Believer: Muslim outwardly and believer inwardly.

The Disbeliever: Disbeliever outwardly and inwardly.

The Hypocrite: Muslim outwardly, hypocrite inwardly. But in reality, in the Hereafter, he is a disbeliever abiding eternally in the Fire. We are speaking about Major Hypocrisy, for he is outside the fold of Islam.

Naturally, Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah elaborated and reviewed very many verses. You even find in the Holy Qur'an, in Sūrah Al-Baqarah for example, that the Qur'an began with two verses describing the believers, then two verses also about the disbelievers.

But look from verse number eight:

وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَن يَقُولُ آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَبِالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَمَا هُم بِمُؤْمِنِينَ

"And of the people are some who say, 'We believe in Allah and the Last Day,' but they are not believers." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 8]

Up to verse number twenty, it is about hypocrisy and the hypocrites. All these verses; sometimes He strikes a parable for them with water, and sometimes with fire.

However, regarding the believers, look; He said:

الَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِالْغَيْبِ وَيُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَمِمَّا رَزَقْنَاهُمْ يُنفِقُونَ * وَالَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِمَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْكَ وَمَا أُنزِلَ مِن قَبْلِكَ وَبِالْآخِرَةِ هُمْ يُوقِنُونَ

"Who believe in the unseen, establish prayer, and spend out of what We have provided for them. And who believe in what has been

revealed to you, [O Muḥammad], and what was revealed before you, and of the Hereafter they are certain [in faith]." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 3-4]

These verses describe the believers.

Then comes:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا سَوَاءٌ عَلَيْهِمْ أَأَنذَرْتَهُمْ أَمْ لَمْ تُنذِرْهُمْ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ * خَتَمَ اللَّهُ عَلَىٰ قُلُوبِهِمْ

"Indeed, those who disbelieve - it is all the same for them whether you warn them or do not warn them - they will not believe. Allah has set a seal upon their hearts." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 6-7]

This is regarding the disbelievers.

But when we started on hypocrisy:

وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَن يَقُولُ آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَبِالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَمَا هُم بِمُؤْمِنِينَ * يُخَادِعُونَ اللَّهَ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَمَا يَخْدَعُونَ إِلَّا أَنفُسَهُمْ وَمَا يَشْعُرُونَ * فِي قُلُوبِهِم مَّرَضٌ فَزَادَهُمُ اللَّهُ مَرَضًا

"And of the people are some who say, 'We believe in Allah and the Last Day,' but they are not believers. They [think to] deceive Allah and those who believe, but they deceive not except themselves and perceive [it] not. In their hearts is disease, so Allah has increased their disease." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 8-10]

Look, all these verses speak about the hypocrite; because the hypocrite is deceitful, because the hypocrite is very dangerous in society. You admit him into your house because he is outwardly a Muslim; he performs the rituals, prays with you in the mosque, attends lessons, attends the Friday prayers and congregations, performs Hajj, and fasts. Outwardly, in front of you. So he is very dangerous! He is privy to your secrets, and this is what Allah said in the Qur'an.

Notice in the Medinan Surahs of the Qur'an; there is hardly a Medinan Surah that did not speak about the hypocrites. Look at Sūrah Āl ʻImrān speaking about hypocrisy:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا بِطَانَةً مِّن دُونِكُمْ لَا يَأْلُونَكُمْ خَبَالًا وَدُّوا مَا عَنِتُّمْ قَدْ بَدَتِ الْبَغْضَاءُ مِنْ أَفْوَاهِهِمْ وَمَا تُخْفِي صُدُورُهُمْ أَكْبَرُ

"O you who have believed, do not take as intimates those other than yourselves [i.e., believers], for they will not spare you [any] ruin. They wish you would have hardship. Hatred has already appeared from their mouths, and what their breasts conceal is greater." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 118]

Then Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* says about them as well:

وَإِذَا لَقُوكُمْ قَالُوا آمَنَّا

"And when they meet you, they say, 'We believe.'" [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 119]

[Meaning] "We are believers!"

وَإِذَا خَلَوْا عَضُّوا عَلَيْكُمُ الْأَنَامِلَ مِنَ الْغَيْظِ

"But when they are alone, they bite their fingertips at you in rage." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 119]

This is the hypocrite. He speaks against you in secret, conspires against you in secret, and embraces you in public, saying: "You are my brother," and smiles at you, but he stabs you, especially if you have power and strength.

Therefore, in the Holy Qur'an, you find Sūrah Barā’ah (At-Tawbah). Its name among the scholars is *Al-Muqashqishah* (The Exposer/Curer); the exposing one that exposed the hypocrites. This Surah spoke about the psychology of hypocrisy and the hypocrite, and how the hypocrite thinks:

الَّذِينَ يَلْمِزُونَ الْمُطَّوِّعِينَ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ فِي الصَّدَقَاتِ

"Those who criticize the contributors among the believers concerning [their] charities." [QS. At-Tawbah: 79]

Mocking and backbiting; they speak and ridicule. He exposed them even when they ridiculed; they would say: "Look at the companions of Muḥammad, the most gluttonous of people," and that they love eating and drinking, and so on. They mocked those who volunteered a small amount. They were saying this amongst themselves.

So Allah exposed them in the Holy Qur'an regarding this, and they said:

كُنَّا نَخُوضُ وَنَلْعَبُ

"We were only conversing and playing." [QS. At-Tawbah: 65]

قُلْ أَبِاللَّهِ وَآيَاتِهِ وَرَسُولِهِ كُنتُمْ تَسْتَهْزِئُونَ * لَا تَعْتَذِرُوا قَدْ كَفَرْتُم

"Say, 'Is it Allah and His verses and His Messenger that you were mocking?' Make no excuse; you have disbelieved." [QS. At-Tawbah: 65-66]

This verse is about the hypocrite, not about the original disbelievers; these [people] were believers [outwardly]. Therefore, the Qur'an says about them:

قُلْ أَبِاللَّهِ وَآيَاتِهِ وَرَسُولِهِ كُنتُمْ تَسْتَهْزِئُونَ * لَا تَعْتَذِرُوا قَدْ كَفَرْتُم بَعْدَ إِيمَانِكُمْ

"Say, 'Is it Allah and His verses and His Messenger that you were mocking?' Make no excuse; you have disbelieved after your belief." [QS. At-Tawbah: 65-66]

He did not say "after your disbelief." So this is the hypocrite; like a snake, its touch is soft, but this deadly poison is found in its mouth.

Therefore, this dangerous category, you find it in the Qur'an. Even in the minor Sūrah Barā'ah, which is Sūrah Al-Munāfiqūn, you find it regarding hypocrisy as well:

وَإِن يَقُولُوا تَسْمَعْ لِقَوْلِهِمْ ۖ كَأَنَّهُمْ خُشُبٌ مُّسَنَّدَةٌ ۖ يَحْسَبُونَ كُلَّ صَيْحَةٍ عَلَيْهِمْ

"And if they speak, you listen to their speech. [They are] as if they were pieces of wood propped up, they think that every shout is against them." [QS. Al-Munāfiqūn: 4]

The hypocrite is confused, lost, ragged, always afraid even though he makes you feel he is strong; but always "they think that every shout is against them."

As Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* said in his time, and he was in the time of goodness, in the year forty-something Hijri approximately, when he said: "Hypocrisy has increased in our days." In his

days, he says hypocrisy has increased! Imagine, in his days hypocrisy increased! So what about our days?! You find, *mā shā’ Allāh*, the "Sheikh of Islam" who is a hypocrite, the misguided caller who is a hypocrite, and this senior Sheikh who is a hypocrite of our time; they beautify [speech] and speak with our tongues.

Therefore, the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* described them as in the authentic Hadith in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Jāmi‘* when he said: "The majority of the hypocrites of my Ummah are its readers (*qurrā’uhā*)."

Qurrā’ (Readers): Meaning the memorizer of the Book of Allah.

Qurrā’: Meaning the scholar; because the word *qurrā’* was a general word, but they intended by it those who recite the Book of Allah and memorize it.

Therefore, you find in history, in the revolution of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ash‘ath in the year 80 AH against Al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, it was called "The Tribulation of the Readers (*Fitnat al-Qurrā’*)" because the scholars and readers, the memorizers of the Book of Allah, were with him. They rebelled against ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān and Al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf.

However, those were righteous readers. As for the Hadith, it speaks about the readers in our time, *mā shā’ Allāh*, he memorizes the Book of Allah, yet applies nothing of it?! He memorizes the Book of Allah and allies with the enemies of Allah?! He memorizes the Book of Allah; what is the end of this memorization? What is the end of this knowledge? What is its effect?

Therefore, Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* says:

إِنَّمَا يَخْشَى اللَّهَ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ الْعُلَمَاءُ

"Only those fear Allah, from among His servants, who have knowledge." [QS. Fāṭir: 28]

Because the scholars are the people who fear [Allah] the most.

You find the hypocrite always memorizing and writing, and you find his tongue influencing people. Despite that, this tongue, in reality, does not go beyond his throat, while you find his heart is a cauldron. This hypocrisy is among the things addressed and emphasized most by the Qur'an. The verses of hypocrisy are more than the verses that spoke about the original disbelievers. You find most verses in the Holy Qur'an speaking about the hypocrites; because the ones who weakened the Islamic State, weakened the Muslims, fractured them, destroyed them, and surrounded them, are the hypocrites.

When he enters Islam, and his name is Muḥammad, and his name is ʻAlī, and his name is Ḥasan, and Maḥmūd, yet he is the very one conspiring against you; this is the danger of this hypocrisy.

Therefore, the scholars divided the people in the era of the Messenger of Allah like this, quite frankly:

The **Muslim**: Meaning Muslim outwardly and inside him, in the inward, he is a believer.

The **True Disbeliever**, on the contrary, in his inward he is a disbeliever and in his outward he is a disbeliever.

The **Hypocrite**: This is the danger, because his outward is Islam and his inward is disbelief.

There is another subsidiary issue, which is: The cause of the appearance of this hypocrisy, and the origin of hypocrisy. The cause of the appearance of hypocrisy, we told you, is the strength of the Muslims in Medina. Therefore, you find the first and second categories were in Mecca, but [hypocrisy] was not in Medina [initially]. However, the origin of the hypocrites was either from the pagan polytheists, or from the polytheists who were People of the Book (*Ahl al-Kitāb*), from the Jews and Christians. Meaning, one accepted Islam and became a hypocrite; he accepted Islam outwardly, but is a disbeliever inwardly. However, we took him based on the outward ruling; we treat him as a Muslim until something appears from him for which we can convict or punish him; because Islam deals with the outward, and this inward is known only to Allah *Subḥānahu wa Taʻālā*.

He says to you: "I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah," and he performs the prayers, and pays the Zakat. So for what do we punish him?! Unless something appears from him.

However:

وَلَتَعْرِفَنَّهُمْ فِي لَحْنِ الْقَوْلِ

"And you would surely know them by the tone of [their] speech." [QS. Muḥammad: 30]

They always discourage the believers, they always speak and spread rumors and gossip. We know the hypocrite; even in this time of ours, we know him. They are now, praise be to Allah, apparent. He does not need to flatter you; how would he flatter [you] when he has power, he has the clan/support, he has the media, and he has the money? So he does not need

you. The hypocrites in our days have power and status. But he flatters in general, saying to you: "I am a Muslim." Even though he attacks the Qur'an, attacks Islam, attacks the Sunnah, and in the end says: "I am a Muslim like you!" How are you a Muslim like me? Because he fears the assault of the Ummah in general; he fears that the people will rebuke him. Meaning, someone might go and commit something [against him], or apply the penalty of apostasy upon him.

He is originally a coward even in this; he exploits the media, exploits the army, exploits the secularists in the state, and exploits the war against Islam, and says to you: "I am a secularist, I am a liberal, I am this," but at the same time "I am a Muslim!" Meaning, when you say "I am a Catholic Muslim," "I am a Communist Muslim," "I am an Orthodox Muslim!" How is that? Combining two opposites together, Paradise and Hellfire together! It does not work.

Therefore, the origin of hypocrisy was from the People of the Book, who wanted to demolish the Islamic State, or feared that the State or Islam would spread in Medina. What would they do? Some of them entered Islam to attack it. Naturally, there is the famous ‘Abdullāh ibn Ubayy ibn Salūl, and there are some hypocrites whom Al-Ḥāfiẓ ibn Kathīr mentioned in *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* in detail, with their lineages and names.

But what concerns us here is that the origin of the hypocrite is either a pagan polytheist, or from the People of the Book from the Jews and Christians, who entered Islam outwardly while being disbelievers inwardly; with the intent of either destroying Islam, or wanting to obtain certain benefits. But in reality, he was a disbeliever inside. However, I cannot detect him because he says: "I am a Muslim." Unless he declares a statement of disbelief; here we punish him, present him to the judge, and hold him accountable.

In this period after the era of the Companions, what is called the "**Zindīq**" (Heretic) appeared; a new term emerged. People differed regarding this naming. You find old books written later in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries and onwards speaking about the rulings of the *Zindīq*. Scholars spoke in the past about the rulings of the *Zindīq*; Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned it, and before Ibn Taymiyyah, many scholars spoke about this *Zindīq*.

Who is the *Zindīq*? *Zindīq* is an Arabized term, originally Persian. Some scholars and linguists said: The origin of this term is *Zandīk* with a 'k' (*kāf*).

You know that when the Islamic State opened [lands] and the power of the Persians was broken at the hands of 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* and at the hands of the early conquerors, and people entered the religion of Allah in multitudes; there were those among the Persians who also entered Islam. The state of Persia was very large, and Rome [as well]. These two states were broken at the hands of Islam and the Muslims in a short period of time.

Meaning, imagine the destiny of the world changed without even passing one hundred years. The Islamic world [stretched] to the borders of China, to Andalusia, to the borders of the Pyrenees mountains, or called the Pyrenees in France, to Portugal. All this within only one hundred years! The Muslims opened all these countries, and they were under the control of Islam. Imagine! What is this that happened?! The Romans, to be able to reach this extent in some countries to occupy them, took five hundred years! And there are some countries, for them to be an easy morsel and to control their destiny, it took one hundred years, and they are small countries! So what about all these vast countries of the Persians and Romans? This entire heritage was under the grip of Islam and the Muslims.

So, will these people leave us alone? Are matters that easy? No. When you overcome him, he will use *Taqiyyah* (dissimulation) with you; to show something and conceal another. Meaning, he shows Islam and conceals disbelief. At that time, these Persians entered. There was a group of followers of the ancient religions of the Persians, followers of Mani (*Mānī*); they were called Zoroastrians (*Zarādashtiyyah*) because these split from them. What is called followers of the text, and those who interpret the text. Like the problem of the Protestants, the Orthodox, and the Catholics. Meaning the Orthodox are textualists (*Nuṣūṣiyyūn*), and the Catholics are Processionists; meaning the Protestants want only the teachings of Christ, they do not want the explanations. As for the Catholics, they interpret, but the others are against the Pope's interpretation; they consider it a heretical interpretation and do not believe in it.

And the others also called them heretics and outside the denomination, meaning disbelievers. Therefore, before Islam, the Zoroastrians accused the followers of Mani of distorting the religion, so they called them *Zanādiqah* (plural of *Zindīq*). When they entered Islam, the word *Zindīq* came to be applied to the atheist, or the one who believes in religions other than the religion of Islam. The word expanded to the degree that the word *Zindīq* became applied to those who were infatuated with libertinism (*mujūn*) and obscenity; they say this is a *Zindīq*. Like the poets of libertinism, such as Abū Dulāmah, Abū Nuwās, and others; they were counted among the poets of the *Zanādiqah*.

Some of them claimed to be ascetics among the ascetics, like Ṣāliḥ ibn ‘Abd al-Quddūs. He was a poet; when he spoke about asceticism (*zuhd*), you might cry, but he was a *Zindīq*. And there was Sālim al-Khāsir and others. All these, as we said, and I have an old article or research from ten years ago titled "The History of the *Zanādiqah* of Literature and Thought: Past and Present," and it is a long article; I reviewed in it the history of *Zandaqah*, its definition, its origin, how it appeared in Islam, and how the Caliphs fought it and dealt with it.

The danger of this *Zandaqah* is that the *Zindīq* in that period, as Ibn Taymiyyah *raḥimahullāhu Ta‘ālā* says: "The *Zindīq* is the *Munāfiq* (Hypocrite)." This is the meaning of the word *Zindīq* in the past. When Ibn Taymiyyah was asked what is the ruling of the *Zindīq*? He said: "In the days of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, this term was not known." They knew in Medina only a *Munāfiq*, we mean Major Hypocrisy, the hypocrite who corresponds to the disbeliever. Thus, this term *Zindīq* came after the era of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* as a result of the entry of the Persians. However, Ibn Taymiyyah says: "The judges and scholars used to deal with these *Zanādiqah* as [being] hypocrites." Hypocrite: meaning an outsider disbeliever; he has nothing special, equivalent to the hypocrite in the days of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*.

But the term evolved, and later the word *Zindīq* came to be applied to an atheist who does not believe in anything. The Arabs used to speak this way.

Therefore, you find, for example, one of the Muslim scholars when he was in Baghdad. He was poor, yet he was a great, masterful scholar. But he became distressed because he was in a place where people did not help him; meaning he sat in the mosque and no one helped him, and he was not from the people of the city. He was from a region either in the East or the West, from areas far from Baghdad. Despite that, he suffered because he could not find his daily sustenance. He teaches and produces scholars, yet no one helps him with anything, and he does not even find work. So he was compelled to take his belongings and depart to his country, because he was tired and could not find his sustenance. The people said: "How can this man leave? Shame on you! Catch up with this man; this is a great blessed scholar, how can he leave?" So he recited two verses of poetry and said:

Baghdad is a home for the people of wealth, a goodly place...

But for the penniless, it is a home of misery and constriction.

I remained bewildered, walking in its alleyways...

As if I were a Muṣḥaf (Qur'an) in the house of a Zindīq.

The point from this poetry, when he said: "As if I were a *Muṣḥaf* in the house of a *Zindīq*." Imagine a *Muṣḥaf* in the house of a *Zindīq*! How can the *Zindīq* tolerate the *Muṣḥaf* while he disbelieves in it? The purpose of the verse: He is illustrating to you that the *Zindīq* is the one who opposes the *Muṣḥaf*. Meaning, O people, do you imagine a *Zindīq* living with a *Muṣḥaf* inside his house?! Do the two meet?! He is expressing his state of distress and extreme poverty that happened to him: "As if I were a *Muṣḥaf* in the house of a *Zindīq*."

Therefore, the scholars said regarding this *Zindīq*: If he wants to repent, what is his ruling? This is an issue also reviewed by Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in his books, in *Al-Fatāwā*, and in the book *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* and *Al-Awsaṭ*. He reviewed it and mentioned it also in his book *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl ʻalā Shātim al-Rasūl*. He also spoke in some of his other major books, and Ibn al-Qayyim also mentioned it in his fatwas regarding the ruling of the *Zindīq* if he comes to you repenting.

Repentance of the Zindīq:

This *Zindīq*, his problem is that you do not know his condition. His outward is Islam. But let us assume he became famous as a *Zindīq*, and we caught him, and he was insulting or cursing, or he wrote something and was caught while writing this poetry, or this poem, or this book, and was brought to the Sharia judge. As for in our time, there is neither a Sharia judge nor otherwise. Here, if you brought him, they would say: "You are against freedom of opinion and freedom of expression" ... and he imprisons you and does not imprison him!

Look at the man in Holland, the owner of the *Fitnah* (Geert Wilders etc.). They said: Freedom of expression! He insults the Qur'an, insults Islam, insults Muslims, insults the Messenger, insults the Lord and the Divine Essence, and speaks even about Jesus *ʻalayhis salām* and they liken him to being a homosexual, and he says to you: Freedom of expression. But the Holocaust, no one speaks about it! Meaning, freedom of expression is here, but why the Holocaust and the Holocaust, no one speaks about it?!

Meaning, they are senile deceivers; these people are enemies of religion fundamentally. So imagine when you say to a judge, even in our countries, the countries of Muslims, he says to you: "Freedom of expression, O brother, and freedom of opinion!"

But we are speaking about the Sharia judge, who rules by what Allah has revealed, and this *Zindīq* who spoke dangerous words is brought

to him. If we brought to him any *Zindīq*; like Jamāl al-Bannā, and like Ḥassan Ḥanafī, and like Ḥāmid Abū Zayd, and Hishām Ju‘ayṭ, and all these famous heretics. If one of these *Zanādiqah* who curse was brought; like Maḥmūd Darwīsh and others. Take the words of Maḥmūd Darwīsh; a *Zindīq* warring against Allah, warring against the Messenger, mocking Islam and the Ka'bah.

If these were brought, they say: Freedom of expression. But before the Sharia judge, he says: "I confess, but I am repenting." Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* accepts repentance, and the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said the door of repentance is open as long as one does not reach the death rattle. Meaning, a human can repent up until the death rattle, and Allah accepts his repentance. But before the judge, what is the ruling?

The scholars differed here. The scholars said regarding the repentance of the *Zindīq* specifically, because it differs from the repentance of any disobedient person. Meaning the thief, the murderer, even the polytheist who committed polytheism and came to you repenting; he differs from the repentance of the *Zindīq*. Because the polytheist repents because he was a polytheist, and he comes to something new which is Islam, so he is seen as repenting. But this one was a Muslim, and uttered words of disbelief, so he is a *Zindīq* by this description. It was declared about him, and he is naturally known to be colorful (deceptive); meaning he practices *Taqiyyah* on you, because the origin of the *Zindīq* is that he shows Islam and conceals disbelief.

The Ḥanafī scholars in their famous view, and the Ḥanbalī scholars, and the Mālikīs, and others among the scholars said: The repentance of this *Zindīq* is not accepted, even if he came repenting. However, the famous view according to Imam Al-Shāfi‘ī is that his repentance is accepted like general repentance.

Meaning any human:

قُلْ يَا عِبَادِيَ الَّذِينَ أَسْرَفُوا عَلَىٰ أَنفُسِهِمْ لَا تَقْنَطُوا مِن رَّحْمَةِ اللَّهِ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَغْفِرُ الذُّنُوبَ جَمِيعًا ۚ إِنَّهُ هُوَ الْغَفُورُ الرَّحِيمُ

"Say, 'O My servants who have transgressed against themselves [by sinning], do not despair of the mercy of Allah. Indeed, Allah forgives all sins. Indeed, it is He who is the Forgiving, the Merciful.'" [QS. Az-Zumar: 53]

So Allah accepts repentance. Thus, if he came repenting based on the general [text], he is like the rest of the disbelievers, or the rest of those who commit sins; so Allah turns to them in forgiveness.

Imam Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim also lean towards the opinion that his repentance is not accepted. Why? Ibn al-Qayyim analyzes this subject, saying: He was originally a Muslim. So he will repent and return to what? He already displays Islam originally! But this is a dangerous person; he might fool the judge, saying: "I will be committed to Islam," and so on. So Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim lean towards the non-acceptance of his repentance because he is dangerous, especially one from whom these issues have recurred.

As for Imam Al-Nawawī, he details the issue. He says: This *Zindīq*, if he is caught and brought to the judge... And let us assume if he came obediently, by choice, without coercion, and came by himself to the judge and said to him: "I was a *Zindīq*, and I did such and such, and I have repented to Allah." Here Imam Al-Nawawī says: "In the first case, it is not accepted." This is the case if he was brought after being caught; the *Muḥtasibūn* (accountability officers) caught him, or individuals from the people caught him, arrested him, and sent him to the judge. Because historically, roughly from the year 168 AH, from the days of Caliph Al-Mahdī and his sons, Caliph Al-Hādī, then Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd (and Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr was the father of Caliph Al-Mahdī), in this period, say from 160 AH or 163 AH to 170 AH or 173 AH, all these Caliphs who came designated a special court, or a special *Muḥtasib*. His name was 'Abd al-Jabbār; his name alone was terrifying. He was specialized in tracking down the *Zanādiqah*.

He used to come for anyone about whom he heard, or if there was a complaint that this person is a *Zindīq* or that one. He would arrest him, present him to the judges, and they would test him. If he was from the poets, he would be brought. Just as was done with Ṣāliḥ ibn 'Abd al-Quddūs when he was brought to Caliph Al-Mahdī, and the Caliph sentenced him to death; because he was evading and dodging. So they confronted him with the poetry he used to say, and that he had a relationship with the *Zanādiqah*, and that he said words of disbelief, and that he displays Islam and conceals disbelief. This man was a poet. And Bashār ibn Burd was a poet, but he was accused of *Zandaqah* as well.

Notice that the poetry of Bashār ibn Burd is beautiful, among those who appeared in the Abbasid state; but it contains *Zandaqah*, and it contains hypocrisy and accusation, and he was spiteful against the Islamic State. Therefore, they accused him of *Zandaqah*. And Ḥammād 'Ajrad and

Abū Nuwās and others. Therefore, you find some university professors and those who obtain PhD and Master's degrees and others always revolve around these people; either around Bashār ibn Burd, and he is the one with the highest share [of attention], and there is Abū Nuwās naturally, and the poetry of libertinism and obscenity, and things containing very many acts of disbelief. However, the scholars in the past spoke about them, and mentioned that they were *Zanādiqah*, and that they used to cover themselves with Islam.

Some scholars say: Perhaps Abū Nuwās repented, though there is no fact that he repented in his last days. But we judge him by his poetry, and by his calamities that appeared. Therefore, they used to track them down.

They say to you: "The Islamic State had all this tolerance, and differences [amounting to] disbeliefs! One atheist, one *Zindīq*... and the history of the *Zanādiqah* in Islam; they lived in the Islamic State, and it accommodated them, *a‘ūdhu billāh*!" Therefore, you find a person attributed to Islam on a talk show, a fool, saying to him: "Yes, but!" What is this "Yes"? This did not exist; there were trials for these people. Who left these people alone? They were left alone because they used to evade and repent; meaning, one comes and repents, or [the act] is not attributed [proven], there is no evidence. The judges did not rule so lightly; when a person is caught, there must be evidence, and there must be witnesses. So they would leave him if there was no evidence. However, they used to put them on trial, and some of them were killed, like Al-Ḥallāj and others.

These *Zanādiqah* used to spread in the state of Banū Buwayh (the Buyids) and under the ‘Ubaydiyyīn (Fatimids), like ‘Umārah al-Yamanī and others; because they used to insinuate and backbite against *Ahl al-Sunnah* and the Companions. Therefore, they used to leave them alone. If you mean the state of the ‘Ubaydiyyīn, then yes.

Therefore, you find them always boasting about the fourth Hijri century. Why do they boast about the fourth Hijri century? They say it was the peak of civilization! No, rather this was the peak of decline, and the beginning of the decline was in the fourth Hijri century; because it was the century of the appearance of the state of Banū Buwayh, and the appearance of the Hashshāshīn (the Assassins/Ismailis) who used to assassinate the Caliphs. The ‘Ubaydī state was controlling the Islamic world at that time. [It saw] the appearance of the Qarmatians (*Al-Qarāmiṭah*), and all the Shiite sects, and *Zandaqah* appeared at that time, and the division of the Abbasid state; it was all in this gloomy period.

Therefore, you find Adam Mez, the orientalist, a great scholar [in their view], has a book *The Renaissance of Islam* (*Al-Ḥaḍārah al-Islāmiyyah*), speaking about this century. But in reality, what is behind the hill? Why did he not speak about the Abbasid era [proper]? Why did he not speak about the Umayyad state? Why did he not speak about the era of the Rightly Guided Caliphs? He speaks on the basis that this [deviation] is the deviation, and that this is called freedom of opinion! Freedom of opinion, even though it involved striking and killing; they were killing pilgrims and caravans, and burying people in the Well of Zamzam. They caused calamities for the entire Islamic world from these sects, and we will speak about some of these issues later, *in shā' Allāh*.

So the witness here is that this hypocrite, as Ibn Taymiyyah said: "The *Zindīq* is the hypocrite in the era of the Messenger of Allah." However, this term evolved later and *Zindīq* came to be said about anything: an atheist, one who hates Islam, people of libertinism and obscenity; every reprehensible meaning you can imagine became attached to the *Zindīq*. But in reality, this *Zindīq*, originally, his reference is the hypocrite. If you said, for example, about a person that he is a hypocrite; I have judged him by the Sharia. How? Meaning you will say about him that he is an apostate (*murtadd*), other than the original disbeliever. The original disbeliever has privileges in the Sharia that are not present for the circumstantial disbeliever (the apostate); because this circumstantial disbelief entered Islam, and the door of the mosque is not like its exit, meaning you enter and exit just like that, no. From here, the punishment of the apostate is harsher than the punishment of the [original] disbeliever.

Because you can make a truce with the original disbeliever, reconcile with him, negotiate with him. As for the apostate in the Sharia, his ruling is non-existence (*al-'adam*); meaning as if he is nothing, he is judged against. Therefore, he has no rights. If, for example, he earned money while he was an apostate, he does not benefit from it, and it has no value, and he cannot buy anything, and he cannot marry, and he is not acknowledged in anything. Even if the ruling was not applied to him, and the principle is that the ruling should be applied to him, but let us assume in the period until the ruling is applied to him, what are his rights if he went to marry? His marriage is void. If he bought something, like land for example or a house? Void; because he is non-existent, nothing. This money goes to the state treasury, meaning the Islamic State.

So this apostate is a dangerous problem, and one does not reconcile with him; meaning you do not make a truce with him or otherwise. He has no solution except to repent, or he is judged with apostasy and killed, and the matter ends.

Therefore, you find some of the defeated people in our days, and some of the scholars of evil and hypocrites, interpreting Hadiths in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* about this apostate; just to please the disbelievers regarding them, and to please the West regarding them! They say: The punishment of the apostate was in the past, and it had a time, and it has interpretations. *A'ūdhu billāh*! These are rulings since the era of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* to our days, a century before the appearance of this secularist onslaught, and people know the Muslim from the apostate, and know that this is the punishment of the apostate, by consensus (*Ijmā'*). These are the authentic books (*Ṣiḥāḥ*), and these are the books of Jurisprudence (*Fiqh*).

And regarding practical applications in the Islamic world, if you returned to the old books speaking about the rulings of the judiciary, you would find that they used to apply the rulings of the apostate. Open any book of Fiqh; open the book *Al-Mabsūṭ* by Al-Sarkhasī, or open *Kitāb al-Hidāyah* by Al-Marghīnānī, or the book *Al-Mughnī* by Ibn Qudāmah, or open the book of Al-Shawkānī, or open the book *Subul al-Salām* by Al-Ṣan'ānī, or any book, even *Fiqh al-Sunnah* by Sheikh Sayyid Sābiq, you find: "Chapter on the Apostate"; the Book of Apostasy, Rulings of Apostasy, conditions, and regulations. Strict matters among the scholars. And then someone comes in this time of ours denying that! If this punishment existed, no audacious person would have dared.

If a person is secure from punishment, sin spreads. When sins spread because people are secure from punishment, one knows that no one will punish him, he will insult, curse, damn, and do what he wants; because no one will punish him. If punishment is secure, sins spread; sins appear with the safety from punishment. But when do sins decrease and their prohibition is known? If the punishment is strong and apparent. It is known that if you do [it], you will be punished. Like if you make for someone an oven of fire, and you bring a beautiful girl, a girl among the most beautiful girls of the worlds, a beauty queen, and you tell him: "Commit fornication with her for one hour, and after the hour, right next to you is this oven." By Allah, is there a soul that would enter this fire? The oven is next to the girl, meaning you finish here and enter here. What will he do? He says: "By Allah, let her go to Hell, I do not want a beauty queen or anything, and I will save myself."

But because people discount the absent (the Hereafter), they do not visualize the Fire. He says: "This is a sin, no problem, I will do it today and tomorrow I will repent. Meaning, I will go commit fornication and enjoy myself these days, then after that, I will say: I seek forgiveness from Allah." Suppose you died on the way?! You might take the sin even if you did not

commit it [physically]; like if he says this alcohol is *halal* (lawful), and he does not drink it, he disbelieves even if he did not drink it. If he made it lawful (*istaḥalla*) and said it is *halal*, while Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* said it is *haram* (unlawful). A person might do things and lose his religion in them, while he did not [physically] do them.

One says fornication is *halal* and an enjoyment, but he does not fornicate, and has no relation to fornication at all; this person disbelieves, even if he did not do it; because he is one who makes the unlawful lawful (*mustaḥill*). The issue is of utmost danger. We will speak, *in shā' Allāh*, later on the subject of major sins, especially when we come to the categories of Muslims, the divisions of *Ahl al-Sunnah* versus the other sects in their difference regarding the appellation of faith (*musammā al-īmān*).

But the summary here in this issue is that Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim lean towards the non-acceptance of the *Zindīq*'s repentance, but Imam Al-Shāfi'ī, in the famous narration from him, [holds] that he accepts the *Zindīq*'s repentance. However, the famous view of the Ḥanafīs, Mālikīs, and Ḥanbalīs, and there are two narrations among the Ḥanbalīs; a famous narration and a non-famous narration, but in general, they do not accept the *Zindīq*'s repentance. However, Imam Al-Nawawī, as I said, detailed the issue; he said: "If the *Zindīq* came repenting voluntarily and obediently, his repentance is accepted. But if he was brought [by force], this is the one whose repentance is not accepted." This is the one whom the jurists speak about in this disputed issue.

So as not to burden you, this is a start at least. This has been an introductory study so far, that we started by the grace of Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* on the issue of the categories of people in the era of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, as we told you and summarized it. You must comprehend it well, *in shā' Allāh*, and they are: The Muslim, the Disbeliever, and the Hypocrite.

We spoke about the origin of hypocrisy and the cause of hypocrisy. We said that the Qur'an paid attention to hypocrisy, to the degree that you find a complete Surah named Sūrah Barā'ah (At-Tawbah), and another Surah named "The Minor Barā'ah," which is Sūrah Al-Munāfiqūn; it speaks about the psychology and traits of the hypocrite and how he thinks. This Surah, Sūrah Barā'ah, is of utmost greatness as it speaks about the categories of hypocrites and the danger of hypocrisy.

We will speak after that, *in shā' Allāh*, about Hypocrisy, Disbelief, and Islam. When we say Disbelief here, we mean Major Disbelief; and when we speak about Hypocrisy here, which is the opposite of Islam, we mean Major Hypocrisy, which is Creedal Hypocrisy. Because there is

practical hypocrisy and creedal hypocrisy. Because the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said: "The signs of the hypocrite are three: when he speaks he lies, when he promises he breaks it, and when he is entrusted he betrays." And there is a Hadith: "The signs of the hypocrite are four: ... and when he quarrels he behaves wickedly." So this is a hypocrite, and he says "the sign of the hypocrite"; but this hypocrisy is called Practical Hypocrisy (*Nifāq 'Amalī*), not the hypocrisy of belief. Hypocrisy of belief is Major Disbelief.

As for Practical Hypocrisy, a Muslim might be stigmatized by it, committing a trait of hypocrisy, or a group of them, and this is called Minor Hypocrisy; just like Major Disbelief and Minor Disbelief, Major Shirk and Minor Shirk, and Major Fisiq (Immorality) and Minor Fisiq. So when we say: Major Disbelief, it means it expels from the Millah (Religion) and he is not a Muslim, and [he goes] to Hellfire if he dies like that.

Minor Hypocrisy means a Muslim, but he committed a trait of hypocrisy, or a Muslim having immorality (*fisq*), a Muslim having a trait of some polytheistic acts, like Minor Shirk. Like: whoever swore by other than the name of Allah; "By the Prophet, by my mother's mercy, by my father's mercy, by my father's grave." This, swearing by other than Allah, is Shirk and has an expiation; either to say: *Lā ilāha illā Allāh*, or to seek forgiveness from Allah. This is called Minor Shirk; it does not expel from the Millah. Yes, the term Shirk is applied to it ("he has committed Shirk"), but other contextual evidences indicate that it is Minor Shirk, and we will speak about it in the Nullifiers of Faith (*Nawāqiḍ al-Īmān*); because the Nullifiers of Faith are very dangerous.

This is what comes to my mind in this context.

I hope the brothers comprehend this lesson, or listen to it again, or take notes. Whoever has a question on this subject [should ask], so that when we finish, *in shā' Allāh*, this course, and hold the exam, you will have comprehended these issues. Because I will give you an *Ijāzah* (license) that you are worthy of this knowledge and that you have comprehended. This is a trust (*amānah*), and [otherwise] I would be bearing false witness, and it is not permissible for me to bear false witness regarding you, that you comprehended and took an *Ijāzah*, while you did not comprehend.

This is a benefit for you primarily before your Lord; you correct your creed, you correct wrong concepts. Believe me, in the end, you will find in every lesson very many things, especially in the coming lessons because they are very important; you will correct or confirm information you had before, *in shā' Allāh*.

Therefore, I hope that we advise each other to the truth and advise each other to patience regarding such lessons, *in shā' Allāh*.

Believe me, the non-Arab youths, out of their great joy with this course, asked me to summarize it for them in a booklet I name *Masā'il fī al-Īmān*. I summarized all this for them, then they edited and adjusted it; because they are diligent, *mā shā' Allāh*, and the book will be printed this week approximately, *in shā' Allāh*.

Naturally, I explained things to them in detail, but in the Arabic language, you will find it much better; because there are issues in the English language that you cannot present to them, due to the fact that it is not the mother tongue, and due to another factor: that regarding their comprehension, a misunderstanding might occur. They might understand you wrongly in some rulings and apply them wrongly. You know the non-Arab brothers, *mā shā' Allāh*, they take something, and he might go and implement it immediately, and transfer you directly to Guantanamo, or to any prison. So we must observe gentleness with them, and the method of understanding and repetition until they comprehend.

You are not less than them, and they, *mā shā' Allāh*, obtained these certificates by the grace of Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā*.

May Allah bless you, and may Allah reward you with all good. I say this saying of mine, and I seek forgiveness from Allah for me and for you.

Wa al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

The Second Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allah; we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allah from the evils of our souls and from our bad deeds. Whomever Allah guides, there is no one to misguide him, and whomever He leads astray, there is no guide for him. I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, alone with no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed:

Here we are with the second lesson of the Sharia course titled *Masā'il fī al-Īmān* (Issues Regarding Faith). Today, here we are also with the twelfth day of the month of Dhūl-Qa'dah, for the year 1432 of the blessed Prophetic Hijrah.

Since we held the past lesson, and we summarize for those who did not attend or review quickly, we said that people in the days of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* were of three categories.

We said they were in Mecca of only two categories:

1. Disbeliever.

2. And Believer.

Then a third category appeared in Medina; due to the strength of the State, and they are the hypocrites.

So people became three categories: A Believer outwardly and inwardly. Opposite him: A Disbeliever outwardly and inwardly. Then a third category appeared: A Muslim outwardly, a Disbeliever inwardly; and they are the hypocrites. We are speaking about Major Hypocrisy and Major Disbelief.

Then we spoke about a new term that appeared in a generation at the end of the generation of the Companions, or approximately in the days of the Abbasids, which is the *Zanādiqah* (Heretics). The word *Zindīq* is synonymous with the hypocrite in the era of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, as Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah said. We spoke about the ruling of the *Zindīq* if he wanted to repent, or was caught before those who caught and arrested him reached the judge, and we mentioned the opinions of the scholars on this matter.

As for today, *in shā' Allāh*, we will speak about the dispute regarding the appellation of faith (*musammā al-īmān*); we will speak about the definition of faith according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and according to the sects, and the cause of the problem, and the outcome of this dispute.

The issue was not just a theoretical issue. Rather, this major dispute that occurred between the scholars made people bold against the Sharia, and against the status of the Sharia, and against the status of Islam, and they mocked it. If the earlier ones had defined faith as Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*) only, and the matter was closer [to practice] in that they applied the teachings of Islam, fought jihad, gave Zakat, and prayed; a generation came after them who became reckless and took these rulings based on their apparent meaning, by the linguistic definition only. So the Great Calamity (*Al-Ṭāmmah al-Kubrā*) occurred, which is what we see now in life's effects, with people's recklessness regarding the Sharia.

Thus, we are not speaking about a theoretical creedal issue, nor are we speaking about ancient historical issues; no, we are speaking about outcomes, and we will mention to you the outcomes of this dispute between the scholars.

So, we will speak about the definition of faith, according to *Ahl al-Sunnah* first, then we will speak after that about the origin of the dispute, and the problems that occurred between all of them. Because the issue is that these people say: "We love the Sharia," and they love Islam, but they differed. The cause of this difference in the origin of the problem came in their definition of the word "Believer" (*Mu'min*). Who is the believer? What is the definition of faith? This is the secret of this dispute.

Naturally, we will give you an introduction, and this introduction is very important, so bite onto it with your molar teeth; because this is what we will revolve around. Because naturally, we will refute some sects, and discuss the opinions of the *Khawārij*, and the sects of the *Murji'ah* with all their divisions, and enter into their doubts. But it must be preserved with you that you proceed upon the foundation of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*, that you believe in the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*. Therefore, we will say in the beginning the definition of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah* for faith, then after that, we will move to the details. So that when we discuss the opinions of the *Murji'ah*, or the sects of the *Murji'ah*, and the doubts of the *Murji'ah*, and the doubts of the *Khawārij* and the *Mu'tazilah* and so on, then we go to other contemporary ramifications; you return in the end, revisit and store it in your mind and heart, that this is the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*.

The Dispute Regarding the Appellation of Faith (*Musammā al-Īmān*):

In the beginning, the cause of the dispute: The problem is in the definition of faith. Most of these sects defined faith as Affirmation

(*Taṣdīq*), and they are the *Murji'ah*; they defined faith by the linguistic meaning.

The people of innovation who appeared in the early period of Islam, then after that multiplied and reproduced until the fourth century, and we told you that Adam Mez and others who wrote on Islamic Civilization say that the fourth century is the century of Islamic civilization, and they glorify it greatly, while it is in reality the century of innovations, the century of the Buyids, the century of the Hashshāshīn and the Qarmatians, and the century of all the people of *Zandaqah* who appeared especially in this period, and the period of the ‘Ubaydiyyīn (Fatimids).

So this faith according to them... they always cite language as evidence, relying on the Arabic language and rational analogies, and they do not rely on texts. Even the one among them who relies on the text interprets it with [distorted] interpretation, twisting the neck of the text. None of them was able to cite Qur'anic verses as evidence as the scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah* did, who refuted these sects. Because they [the sects] said faith is: Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*), and they cited the verse:

وَمَا أَنتَ بِمُؤْمِنٍ لَّنَا

"But you would not be a believer in us." [QS. Yūsuf: 17]

Meaning: You are not an affirmer/believer (*muṣaddiq*) of us.

Here Imam Ibn Taymiyyah, and before him Imam Al-Ājurrī by centuries, so Imam Ibn Taymiyyah is not an innovator in this, but rather he transmitted the sciences of others and the opinions of others like Ibn Ma‘īn, Ibn al-Madīnī, Ibn Khaythamah, Al-Ḥāfiẓ ibn Abī Shaybah and others. All these great *Ḥuffāẓ* (Hadith Masters), in addition to Imam Al-Bukhārī and the Imams of Hadith; all of them do not acknowledge what these *Murji'ah* acknowledge, those who say that faith means: Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*). Like Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī, the Sheikh of the *Ash‘āriyyah*, when he said: "Faith is: Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*)." And this came from Ibn Ṣafwān who said: "Affirmation."

Now we will begin reading the origin of the Hadith, about which we told you that Ibn Taymiyyah *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi* authored his two books *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* and *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ*. All these questions are an explanation of the Hadith of Jibrīl. His students came, like Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī also, and explained the Hadith of Jibrīl in *Jāmi‘ al-‘Ulūm wa al-Ḥikam*. And all of those, even the *Ḥuffāẓ* who refuted the people of innovation like Imam Al-Ājurrī and others, refuted also through the explanation of the Hadith of Jibrīl in which the Messenger *ṣallallāhu*

'alayhi wa sallam said, he said to 'Umar: "It is Jibrīl, he came to teach you your religion." So this is the religion; meaning the levels of this religion, which are: Islam, *Īmān* (Faith), *Iḥsān* (Excellence).

So we begin with the first Hadith, then we will speak after that about the definition of faith according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and discuss after that the origin of the problem.

Regarding the Hadith of Jibrīl as in the *Ṣaḥīḥ*; we will read the narration found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, and it is found in the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*; because in the narration of Imam Muslim there is a detailed narration. As for the narration of Imam Al-Bukhārī, it is a summarized narration limited to the essentials. But the Hadith in its length and completeness was cited with its chain of transmission by Imam Muslim in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, until he reached:

"Kahmas narrated to us from Ibn Buraydah from Yaḥyā ibn Ya'mar who said: The first one to speak about *Al-Qadar* (Divine Decree) in Basra was Ma'bad al-Juhanī. I and Ḥumayd ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥimyarī set out for Hajj or 'Umrah. We said: 'If only we meet one of the Companions of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, and ask him about what these people say regarding *Al-Qadar*.' We were granted success to meet 'Abdullāh ibn 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb entering the mosque. My companion and I surrounded him, one of us on his right and the other on his left. I thought that my companion would leave the speech to me, so I said: 'O Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān, there have appeared among us people who recite the Qur'an and pursue knowledge' —and he mentioned their affair— 'and they claim that there is no *Qadar* and the matter is *unuf* (new/unprecedented).' He said: 'If you meet those people, inform them that I am innocent of them, and they are innocent of me' —or 'they are free of me'—. By the One by Whom 'Abdullāh ibn 'Umar swears, if one of them had the like of Uḥud in gold and spent it, Allah would not accept it from him until he believes in *Al-Qadar*.' Then he said: My father 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb narrated to me saying: While we were with the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* one day, a man appeared before us, with very white clothing and very black hair. No trace of travel was seen upon him, and none of us knew him. Until he sat down before the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, rested his knees against his knees, and placed his palms on his thighs. He said: 'O Muḥammad, inform me about Islam.' The Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said: 'Islam is to testify that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah, to establish prayer, to give Zakat, to fast Ramadan, and to perform Hajj to the House if you are able to find a way.' He said: 'You have spoken the truth.' He said: 'We were amazed at him asking him and [then] verifying him.' He said: 'Then inform me about *Īmān*

(Faith).' He said: 'That you believe in Allah, His angels, His books, His messengers, and the Last Day, and that you believe in *Al-Qadar* (Divine Decree), its good and its bad.' He said: 'You have spoken the truth.' He said: 'Then inform me about *Iḥsān*.' He said: 'That you worship Allah as if you see Him, for if you do not see Him, He sees you.' He said: 'Then inform me about the Hour.' He said: 'The one questioned about it knows no more than the questioner.' He said: 'Then inform me about its signs.' He said: 'That the slave girl gives birth to her mistress, and that you see the barefoot, naked, destitute shepherds competing in constructing tall buildings.' He said: 'Then he departed; and I stayed for a while.' Then he said to me: 'O ‘Umar, do you know who the questioner was?' I said: 'Allah and His Messenger know best.' He said: 'It was Jibrīl, who came to you to teach you your religion.'"

Or as he *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said, as in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* in its completeness.

This is the Hadith around which the scholars revolved and explained. This is a complete book by Ibn Taymiyyah named *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr*, and the book *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ*, and there is a small memorandum named *Al-Īmān al-Ṣaghīr*. And what Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī mentioned regarding this Hadith, and the commentators on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* like Imam Al-Nawawī and others who explained this Hadith; they spoke about this religion, this is the religion.

And what Ibn ‘Umar cited as evidence: "And that you believe in *Al-Qadar*, its good and its bad"; because he said to him: "The matter is *unuf*." The Decree is *unuf*. When we say "The *Qadariyyah*": meaning the deniers of *Qadar*. When we say "The matter is *unuf*": meaning the matter is initiated anew, meaning Allah did not decree it, *wa al-‘iyādhu billāh*, meaning people do anything, and this is new. Meaning [they claim] I held something, or hit someone, Allah did not decree this, this happened just now.

Therefore, Ibn ‘Umar said: "I am innocent of them, and they are innocent of me." The witness here is that he clarified to him that this is the religion ("and that you believe in *Al-Qadar*, its good and its bad"). Thus, he intends faith in *Al-Qadar*, and that *Al-Qadar* is not *unuf* (unprecedented) as these *Qadariyyah* and Ma‘bad al-Juhanī said. This issue is found in the books of sects, *in shā’ Allāh*, we will speak about it later.

Now we will begin with the definition of "Faith" (*Īmān*) according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*. Memorize it, and memorize what I say to you now, then after that store it in memory. This is the fundamental rule, then we will proceed after that to discuss the other sects. But first, we will say to you: This is the definition of faith according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*. This is the book

Al-Sharī'ah by Imam Abū Bakr al-Ājurrī, who died in the year 360 AH, about five centuries before Imam Ibn Taymiyyah approximately.

This is an Imam from the great Imams of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, he says: "Chapter: The statement that faith is affirmation (*taṣdīq*) by the heart, acknowledgment (*iqrār*) by the tongue, and action (*'amal*) by the limbs; one is not a believer unless these three qualities are combined in him. Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan said: Know, may Allah have mercy on us and you, that what the scholars of the Muslims are upon is that faith is obligatory upon all creation; and it is affirmation by the heart, acknowledgment by the tongue, and action by the limbs. Then know that knowledge by the heart and affirmation do not suffice unless there is with it faith by the tongue in speech, and knowledge by the heart and speech by the tongue do not suffice until there is action by the limbs. So if these three qualities are complete in him, he is a believer. The Book, the Sunnah, and the sayings of the scholars of the Muslims indicate this. As for what is incumbent upon the heart regarding the obligation of faith, it is the saying of Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* in Sūrah Al-Mā'idah: 'O Messenger, let them not grieve you who hasten into disbelief of those who say, "We believe" with their mouths, but their hearts believe not.' [QS. Al-Mā'idah: 41] Up to His saying: 'Those are the ones for whom Allah does not intend to purify their hearts.' [QS. Al-Mā'idah: 41]"

So this is what is required; faith of the heart is necessary, and this is the proof for faith of the heart from the Qur'an. Thus, faith by the heart is an obligation.

And He said:

مَن كَفَرَ بِاللَّهِ مِن بَعْدِ إِيمَانِهِ إِلَّا مَنْ أُكْرِهَ وَقَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالْإِيمَانِ وَلَٰكِن مَّن شَرَحَ بِالْكُفْرِ صَدْرًا فَعَلَيْهِمْ غَضَبٌ مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَلَهُمْ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ

"Whoever disbelieves in Allah after his belief... except for one who is forced [to renounce his religion] while his heart is secure in faith. But those who [willingly] open their breasts to disbelief, upon them is wrath from Allah, and for them is a great punishment." [QS. An-Naḥl: 106]

This verse (106) in Sūrah An-Naḥl indicates faith of the heart as well.

And He *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* said:

قَالَتِ الْأَعْرَابُ آمَنَّا ۖ قُل لَّمْ تُؤْمِنُوا وَلَٰكِن قُولُوا أَسْلَمْنَا وَلَمَّا يَدْخُلِ الْإِيمَانُ فِي قُلُوبِكُمْ

"The Bedouins say, 'We have believed.' Say, 'You have not [yet] believed; but say [instead], "We have submitted," for faith has not yet entered your hearts.'" [QS. Al-Ḥujurāt: 14]

Meaning, faith by the heart is a necessary obligation. This affirmation is acknowledgment and action; it is affirmation conditioned by special conditions, unlike the definition of the people of innovation. According to *Ahl al-Sunnah*, affirmation of the heart differs, for the heart has action, and they [the innovators] do not acknowledge the action of the heart; they acknowledge only affirmation, acknowledgment, or knowledge. So this indicates that the heart has faith, which is affirmation and knowledge, and speech by the [tongue] is of no benefit if the heart does not affirm what the tongue utters, along with action. So know that.

This Imam Al-Ājurrī lectures us from the fourth Hijri century, meaning there is more than a thousand years between us and him. This is the merit of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, especially those whom the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* mentioned, saying: "The best of generations is my generation, then those who follow them, then those who follow them." He spoke about the three best generations. And in a narration, he mentioned the fourth generation. But notice in the first three generations the purity of creed, and observe faith according to them. This is the cause of the problem with these innovators, that they say in their books: It is obligatory upon any Muslim who is born... the "second knowledge" is necessary; the believer is not [a true believer] unless he brings this second knowledge. This "first knowledge" is merely that he is born a Muslim; meaning he utters the *Shahādatayn* and that's it. But the second knowledge: that he knows Allah; he must know Allah through rational deduction, otherwise he is a blind follower (*muqallid*).

Of course, this speech is false and an innovation. Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* obligated what Allah obligated upon us: that we testify that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah; this is what is required from the Muslim. He did not impose rational deduction upon them, otherwise most people do not use deductions. But they imposed obligations and certain philosophical things, with premises and conclusions, and made them binding for people to do. He says to you: "The second knowledge." The first knowledge: knowing Allah by way of being born a Muslim, saying "I testify that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of

Allah," they do not recognize this. He says to you: You must bring the second knowledge, otherwise you are a blind follower. *A'ūdhu billāh*!

This *Taqlīd* (blind following) according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*... a person is not a blind follower [in faith]. Therefore, he uses his intellect and researches evidences. But this [term *Taqlīd* applies] if a man blindly follows another man in a matter for which Allah and His Messenger did not give permission; yes, we say this is a blind follower, and you should know the evidence. But the one who says to you: "I will take this Hadith, I will adhere to this Hadith," you call him a blind follower?!

Allah says:

وَأَقِيمُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتُوا الزَّكَاةَ

"And establish prayer and give zakat." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 43]

You call me a blind follower! The Messenger orders us with good morals, or orders us with things, and sets sunnahs for us, and we follow; we say: "This is *Taqlīd*!" This is following (*Ittibā'*) the Messenger of Allah, even if you name it *Taqlīd*. Regarding the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, there is no [*Taqlīd*] as he is a legislator from Allah. And regarding Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā*, he who follows Allah in His commands, and follows the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* in what he conveyed from his Lord, this person is not a blind follower.

They say: "No, you must, even if you are like this, use your intellect, and you must initially know Allah." And the first knowledge of the heart, this knowledge is enough; if you knew that Allah is the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and the One who sent the Messengers, and you felt this in your heart, that's enough, nothing more matters. You are a believer now and the matter is finished. This is a problem we will discuss with you later, *in shā' Allāh*.

But we say: Imam Al-Ājurrī *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* says to us: "This indicates to you that faith is upon the heart, which is affirmation and knowledge, and speech is of no benefit if the heart does not affirm what the tongue utters, along with action."

Okay, what is the proof for faith by the tongue? Which is the speech of the tongue. Meaning, does it work if one says: "I acted by the heart only, my heart believes in Allah, my heart is full (*'āmir*) with Allah, O brother!" There are people who say this: "O brother, our Lord is a Lord of hearts!" You say to him: "Pray." He says: "Our Lord is a Lord of hearts." "O my daughter, wear hijab." She says to you: "Our Lord is a Lord of hearts," "My heart is full of faith, O brother." Okay, what is the outcome [showing] that

your heart is full? What is the proof that your heart is full? This is proof of ruin!

Therefore, he says what is the proof for the tongue? The tongue in the Sharia: meaning from the auditory/textual perspective; Allah the Exalted says:

قُولُوا آمَنَّا

"Say, 'We have believed...'" [QS. Al-Baqarah: 136]

"Say" (*qūlū*); this is not for the heart, for we knew faith by the heart.

But the proof for faith of the tongue, this is at the end of Sūrah Al-Baqarah:

قُولُوا آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَمَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْنَا وَمَا أُنزِلَ إِلَىٰ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَإِسْمَاعِيلَ وَإِسْحَاقَ وَيَعْقُوبَ وَالْأَسْبَاطِ وَمَا أُوتِيَ مُوسَىٰ وَعِيسَىٰ وَمَا أُوتِيَ النَّبِيُّونَ مِن رَّبِّهِمْ

"Say, [O believers], 'We have believed in Allah and what has been revealed to us and what has been revealed to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and the Descendants and what was given to Moses and Jesus and what was given to the prophets from their Lord...'" [QS. Al-Baqarah: 136]

And Allah the Exalted said in Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān:

قُلْ آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَمَا أُنزِلَ عَلَيْنَا وَمَا أُنزِلَ عَلَىٰ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَإِسْمَاعِيلَ وَإِسْحَاقَ وَيَعْقُوبَ وَالْأَسْبَاطِ وَمَا أُوتِيَ مُوسَىٰ وَعِيسَىٰ وَالنَّبِيُّونَ مِن رَّبِّهِمْ

"Say, 'We have believed in Allah and in what was revealed to us and what was revealed to Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, and the Descendants, and in what was given to Moses and Jesus and to the prophets from their Lord...'" [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 84]

So speech is important; without it, one is not a believer in this world.

We will speak about the relationship between *Īmān* (Faith) and Islam. Is Islam *Īmān*? And is *Īmān* Islam? And what is the relationship between them? But when I speak and say: "Believer" (*Mu’min*), it is mostly

understood that I mean Muslim, otherwise the verses that say: "O you who have believed" (*Yā ayyuhā alladhīna āmanū*); why did He not say: "O you who have submitted (*aslamū*)"? For those addressed by it are those who have submitted. So faith and Islam [are interconnected]. We will research the difference of scholars on this issue.

But now "Say" (*Qul*) is proof for speech, from Sūrah Al-Baqarah and Āl ʻImrān. The Qur'an is full of these statements. It does not work for one to say: "Only in my heart." The second pillar is necessary. The definition of faith has three pillars, the pillars of faith [itself] are six, but the definition of faith itself, from the terminological perspective, has three pillars:

First Pillar: Faith by the heart; acknowledgment, affirmation, knowledge by the heart.

Second Pillar: By the tongue; acknowledgment by the tongue, speech by the tongue.

Third Pillar: Action by the limbs.

The Prophet *ṣallallāhu ʻalayhi wa sallam* said in the Hadith in the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*: "I have been ordered to fight the people until they say: There is no deity worthy of worship except Allah and that I am the Messenger of Allah." Meaning "until they say"; speech is necessary. It does not work for you to say to him: "I am a Muslim, but I will not say 'I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah.'" It is not sufficient for him to say: "The testimony is inside me," he must utter it. Therefore, the one capable of the testimony must utter it, except the mute or the one with a speech impediment or something; he gestures that he testifies and repeats this in his language, or sign language, or otherwise.

As for those who speak and are capable, one is not a believer until he says it, testifies like this. The heart alone does not suffice, nor does speech alone suffice. "So this faith by the tongue, in speech, is an obligatory duty." Meaning it is an obligatory duty that he speaks with the tongue. "As for faith via what Allah obligated upon the limbs, as a confirmation (*taṣdīq*) of what the heart believed in and the tongue uttered..." The limbs: the hand, the leg, the tongue, movements, and action; these are the limbs.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا ارْكَعُوا وَاسْجُدُوا

"O you who have believed, bow and prostrate." [QS. Al-Ḥajj: 77]

Action, movement:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا ارْكَعُوا وَاسْجُدُوا وَاعْبُدُوا رَبَّكُمْ وَافْعَلُوا الْخَيْرَ لَعَلَّكُمْ تُفْلِحُونَ

"O you who have believed, bow and prostrate and worship your Lord and do good - that you may succeed." [QS. Al-Ḥajj: 77]

So this is required, an obligation here: faith by the limbs.

Action: meaning action with these limbs; we pray, we give zakat in action like this.

And He *Jalla wa ‘Alā* said:

وَأَقِيمُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتُوا الزَّكَاةَ

"And establish prayer and give zakat." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 43]

Notice: "establish prayer and give zakat"; so the action of the limb is necessary. Speech alone does not suffice. In more than one place in the Qur'an... And similarly, fasting is imposed, for example, upon the whole body. Hajj is a physical worship along with financial. Jihad is physical and financial. There are shared acts of worship; meaning there are physical acts of worship, financial acts of worship, and acts of worship shared between physical and financial. So actions, may Allah have mercy on you, are by the limbs.

As Imam Al-Ājurrī says: "A confirmation (*taṣdīq*) of faith by the heart and the tongue; so whoever does not confirm faith by his action and his limbs: such as purification, prayer, Zakat, fasting, Hajj, Jihad, and what resembles these, and is satisfied for himself with knowledge and speech; he is not a believer, and knowledge and speech do not benefit him. His abandonment of action is a denial (*takdhīb*) by him of his faith, and action according to what we mentioned is a confirmation (*taṣdīq*) by him of his faith. And He said: 'That you may make clear to the people what was sent down to them and that they might give thought.' [QS. An-Naḥl: 44] So the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* clarified to his Ummah the laws of faith, that they are upon this description in numerous Hadiths. And Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla* said in His Book and clarified in more than one place that faith is not [valid] except with action, and the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* clarified it, contrary to what the *Murji'ah* said, with whom Satan played."

Therefore, he mentioned Hadiths proving what he says, that faith is action. Faith is originally action by the limb.

When Allah says:

وَمَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُضِيعَ إِيمَانَكُمْ

"And never would Allah have caused you to lose your faith." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 143]

Here the Companions were asking after the changing of the Qiblah: "What is the status of our brothers who prayed towards Bayt al-Maqdis before?" So Allah said: "And never would Allah have caused you to lose your faith." He named prayer "Faith." Prayer is faith; this is contrary to the speech of the *Murji'ah*, and those who say faith is affirmation (*taṣdīq*). Rather, "Faith is Action," it is named thus.

So Imam Al-Ājurrī *raḥimahullāhu* says: "And know, may Allah have mercy on us and you, that I have perused the Qur'an," he says this is an introduction so you may be reassured; memorize it in memory well. Because we will proceed to doubts and things, but refresh the memory when you forget; because we will enter a forest and corridors with the doubts, so that you do not forget. One might cling to the doubt and not the foundation. So this is what I am saying so far, it is the foundation. I chose only the words of Al-Ājurrī because he summarizes all our speech. All books are full of this very subject, especially the scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*, these great ones.

Therefore, he said: "Know, may Allah have mercy on us and you, that I have perused the Qur'an, and I found in it what I mentioned, in fifty-six places in the Book of Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*; that Allah *Tabāraka wa Ta'ālā* did not enter the believers into Paradise by faith alone, but He entered them into Paradise by His mercy upon them, and by what He granted them success to perform of faith in Him and righteous action. This is a refutation of whoever said: Faith is knowledge. And a refutation of whoever said: Faith is knowledge and speech, even if he did not act."

Meaning, if he died and knows his Lord, and acknowledged the Testimony, acknowledges and affirms with his heart and his tongue, and died and did not do anything at all, they say: "He is a believer entering Paradise, even if he did not pray a rak'ah in his life, and did not do anything, he enters Paradise!" So he tells them and refutes them: "And this is a refutation of whoever said: Faith is knowledge. And a refutation of whoever said: Faith is knowledge and speech, even if he did not act. We seek refuge in Allah from the sayer of this." And we also seek refuge in Allah from the sayer of this. "If a sayer says: Mention this which you clarified from the Book of Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* so that others besides you may dispense with perusing the Qur'an." So he *raḥimahullāh* began with the places he mentioned, which are fifty-six. He mentioned very many

places and verses proving that action enters into faith. Therefore, he says after listing all this and reviewing all the verses, and after that reviewing the Hadiths and evidences from the Sunnah, he says: "Distinguish, may Allah have mercy on you, the saying of your Noble Master: Did He mention faith in a single place in the Qur'an, except that He coupled righteous action to it?"

He disapproves [rhetorically]; a rhetorical question: Distinguish faith in fifty-six places, always coupled with righteous action. This is a refutation of the *Murji'ah* regarding that.

So we will suffice with this amount, regarding this general definition. We will use such definitions and return to them during our discussion of these innovations.

But the summary here regarding this issue:

Faith has three pillars: Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*), Acknowledgment (*Iqrār*), Knowledge (*Ma'rifah*).

Affirmation by the heart, and action by the heart; the heart also performs action. The *Murji'ah* do not acknowledge that the heart acts; they say to you affirmation with knowledge, and the matter is finished; they do not acknowledge the action of the heart.

Like what is the action of the heart? Action of the heart: Love for the sake of Allah, hatred for the sake of Allah; these are things in the heart. They do not acknowledge this; meaning you find them saying to you: Faith is knowledge only, you knew your Lord, that's it; you affirmed Allah. Faith means affirmation. "I believe that Allah created the heavens and the earth, He is the One who sent Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* and sent the Messengers, and sent the Qur'an." That's it, the matter is finished inside you.

But the heart and the movement of the heart, and the action of the heart; it fears, hates, loves, dislikes, allies, shows enmity, and so on; all this is in the heart. How do I know these things? Well, He says to you: His heart humbled (*khasha'a*), their hearts humble to the remembrance of Allah:

أَلَمْ يَأْنِ لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَن تَخْشَعَ قُلُوبُهُمْ

"Has the time not come for those who have believed that their hearts should become humble..." [QS. Al-Ḥadīd: 16]

"Become humble" (*takhsha'a*); so the heart acts. They do not acknowledge this and say there is no action, it suffices that you are a

believer that there is a God, Creator of the heavens and the earth, and knowledge only, and the matter is finished.

However, the maximum thing he says to you: The tongue. Some *Murji'ah* and some *Ash'āriyyah*, they differed on that. Some said: The heart and the tongue only. But all are united on expelling action from the definition of faith, even if they differ in details.

Therefore, you must memorize three things: **Faith is: Belief by the heart, speech by the tongue, and action by the pillars (action by the limbs).**

Three pillars, not three conditions; because some scholars and some contemporaries tried to insert actions, while falling into a problem thinking they are following *Ahl al-Sunnah*. Some contemporaries among those called Contemporary Salafism, these Jāmis and Madkhalis and all these, who have *Irjā'* in such issues, what did they do? They acknowledged action, and they say "action by the pillars," they say that in the definition of faith; but this action by the pillars according to them is a condition of perfection (*sharṭ kamāl*), meaning something unimportant; meaning if one did not act, he enters Paradise as well.

Notice what the Imam says to you: If he applied the two and did not act in his life, he is not a believer. The definition is the three together, otherwise it does not work. One says to you: "I am a believer," faith is in his heart or his tongue for example, but he does not act; so the definition of action is missing. Like the soul and the body. Meaning, can we say: a body without a soul? How will the body move? There must be a soul. We cannot separate them from each other; you cannot separate them, otherwise it becomes dead.

Even to call him a human; otherwise, we will call him a corpse or a body. Your father is sitting with you, he died and the soul exited. What do you call him? Do you say: "My father is with me now"? Or what do you say? "We want to bury the corpse"; because he became without a soul, he became a body only. "We escorted the corpse," "We buried the corpse," although this is your father or your brother or your son. But when there was the movement of the soul, we called him a human; Muḥammad, 'Alī, like that. If the soul exits, it's over.

So Faith, these are its pillars. And the pillar is part of the thing; meaning if you cut it, the thing is cut. Unlike the condition (*sharṭ*), which is outside the thing. But they, by their will, said it is a necessary condition (*sharṭ lāzim*); yet they did not do that [in reality], they said a condition like ablution, a condition for prayer. But they said: a condition of perfection,

meaning recommended (*mustaḥabb*), no problem if he does it or not. But if he dies and did not act, if he dies and did not pray a rak'ah for Allah, if he dies and did not fast in his life, if he dies and did not perform Hajj while capable, if he dies and did not fight Jihad, if he dies and did not seek all these acts of goodness, if he did not do acts of obedience at all, they said he is a believer with complete faith, and enters Paradise. They gave him, *mā shā’ Allāh*, a visa, he enters straight away at his leisure!

They say this like Salvation in Christianity; that Christ was tortured for the sake of humanity, *‘alayhis salām*, far be it from Christ and *a‘ūdhu billāh*, and he will save us, such that any human does any deed, that's it; Christ was tortured for your sake. He fornicates, steals, kills, does machinations, as they do in the world now; they rampage, kill, steal, and fornicate. You find even the priest of 60 or 70 years; and those coming to the church are their children from illicit relations (*ḥarām*), and all this *ḥarām*. And he says to you: The priest was a rapist of all these children. And he says to you: Actually, the adults have no shame, especially the churches in America. He says to him: "Wash me," so he washes him, washes the shame and disgrace; so he enters with him while washing them, goes to the confessional chair and relieves him.

Even these people say to you: Christ will forgive us all. Why? Because he was tortured for our sake. The idea of this Savior entered here. Just as they say: "It suffices you to believe in Christ," he says: "It suffices you to affirm faith totally. Say: I acknowledge that there is a God, and I acknowledge that there is Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, and I acknowledge the Qur'an." Yes, acknowledging all this, but I do not act. This is the Savior, meaning you enter Paradise.

In the past, they had shame (*ḥayā’*), despite all the definitions; know! They used to fight Jihad and act. Meaning even those who did that, they used to enjoin good and forbid evil. But after that, people increased in boldness regarding religion. Why? He obtained a deed of forgiveness (*ṣakk ghufrān*). "Indeed Sheikh so-and-so told me: It suffices you to say 'Your Lord is a Lord of hearts,' or do you not say: 'I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah'? 'Whoever says: There is no deity worthy of worship except Allah enters Paradise'." They rely on this Hadith from the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, and they rely on the Hadith of the Card (*Biṭāqah*), and they rely on the Hadith of Al-Uṣayrim ‘Amr ibn Waqīsh in the Battle of Uḥud. He came, accepted Islam, and fought until he was killed. The Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: "He did little work and was rewarded much." He did not pray to Allah.

Abū Hurayrah *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* used to say: "Shall I guide you to a man from the people of Paradise? He never prayed a single rak'ah for Allah and entered Paradise." So people were astonished! Who is he? He said: "It is Al-Uṣayrim, 'Amr ibn Waqīsh. He accepted Islam at Uḥud." He accepted Islam in the battlefield and was killed. So the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said: "He did little, easy work and was rewarded much." They relied on this, "and he did not pray a single rak'ah for Allah." But here, he did not live for the details of Islam. This man accepted Islam, said: "I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah," this is what he was commanded with, that's it, finished. But if he lived, would he be left not praying, not fasting, not giving zakat, not doing anything? And enter Paradise! He says: "Thus said the Imams of Islam, and this is our religion!"

So this is what we say, that this is the origin of the dispute between these scholars in the past. We summarize the issue and the cause of the problem for you, then I will review for you models of these sects, *in shā' Allāh*, then we begin detailing the doubts and refuting them. Naturally, we will not leave doubts etc., there is no doubt but that we will refute it. But we are still speaking about the origin of the dispute. Thus, the origin of the dispute is in the definition of faith. There are those who defined faith and expelled action from it, and there are those who defined faith and included action in it. So the cause of the dispute is in including action and expelling action.

You have here categories of people.

The cause of the origin of the dispute regarding the appellation of faith, the cause of the dispute in their definition of faith:

A group made action and included it in the appellation of faith.

This is the first group.

The second group: A group expelled action from faith.

Meaning, for them action here is not a pillar, but for this [first] group, action is a pillar.

Who is the first group? The first group: They are **Ahl al-Sunnah**. If it is said *Ahl al-Sunnah*; we mean by them the Companions and the Successors (*Tābi'ūn*), these generations are called the *Salaf*, and everyone who believes the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. Meaning Faith: Acknowledgment, affirmation by the heart with speech and action, meaning speech of the heart and action of the heart, and speech of the

tongue and action by the pillars; three are necessary. Those who held this view are: *Ahl al-Sunnah*, the *Khawārij*, and the *Mu‘tazilah*.

Imagine, the *Khawārij* and the *Mu‘tazilah* agreed with *Ahl al-Sunnah* on including action in the appellation of faith; meaning they made action a pillar. Meaning, the *Khawārij*, the *Mu‘tazilah*, and *Ahl al-Sunnah* agree on the definition of faith, and they all made action a pillar in the definition of faith.

But the other group: The one that expelled action from faith. First are the **Jahmiyyah**, after that the **Murji'ah**. These *Murji'ah* are many sects naturally. And among these you have the **Karrāmiyyah**, and among these you have the **Ash‘āriyyah**, naturally the *Ash‘āriyyah* are from the whole of the Sharia [context], and the **Māturīdiyyah**; because they appeared in a close time. Here we will speak about them: What is the difference between the *Ash‘āriyyah* and the *Māturīdiyyah*? Because they agree a lot on things, but they agree on expelling action from the appellation of faith. They differ in some simple details, not a substantial difference.

And these *Murji'ah* are very many sects, we will speak about them; the Ghassāniyyah, the Ṣāliḥiyyah, the Tūmaniyyah, the Najjāriyyah, and very many sects. Al-Bāqillānī counted them as twelve sects, and some counted them as seven sects, but you can summarize them into three in the end. These are sects and names that appeared, and they are among the pillars and famous ones of the *Murji'ah*. [Opposite to] this group that included action in the appellation of faith.

Meaning Faith according to us has three pillars: Faith is affirmation (*taṣdīq*) by the heart, naturally affirmation by the heart according to the terminology of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, not according to their terminology; affirmation by the heart: meaning affirmation and action of the heart, and they acknowledge the action of the heart. And speech by the tongue; speech by the tongue meaning acknowledgment by the tongue. After that action by the pillars, which are the limbs. Meaning these three were agreed upon by *Ahl al-Sunnah*, the *Khawārij*, and the *Mu‘tazilah* in the definition of faith.

But a sayer might say: "Okay, if the *Khawārij*, *mā shā’ Allāh*, are loved ones, and the *Mu‘tazilah* are our brothers in Allah, why did we differ with them? And why did they kill us? And killed the Companions? And permitted the blood of the Ummah? And how are they the *Mu‘tazilah* who innovated the heresy of prioritizing reason over revelation? And the five principles they acknowledge..."

Of course we will speak about them later. But I am recounting the reason in summary; they agreed with *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the definition of faith, in including action in the appellation of faith.

But the difference between them is that *Ahl al-Sunnah* consider the perpetrator of a major sin (*kabīrah*) as remaining inside faith; we do not expel him from absolute faith (*muṭlaq al-īmān*). But they considered the one who commits a major sin not a believer. Meaning, they included action, so according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*, the one who violates this action by committing a major sin, we do not withdraw the attribute of Islam from him.

We say: A believer or Muslim deficient in faith. We say: His ruling in the Hereafter is under the Will (*Mashī'ah*). If he committed a major sin —murder, fornication, any of the major sins— and did not repent, and died upon this, we say: He died a Muslim, but he is under the Will. He has states, naturally we will speak about them in detail; if Allah wills, He pardons him and admits him to Paradise without punishment, this is how He created him and He wants to do what He wills. And if He wills, He punishes him and puts him in the Fire, but he does not abide eternally in it.

The *Khawārij* say: He abides eternally in it; because he died a disbeliever. So they withdrew faith from him originally in totality.

Thus we say: Even if the *Khawārij* and *Mu'tazilah* acknowledged that action is included in the appellation of faith, with *Ahl al-Sunnah*; however, we differed with them regarding the perpetrator of a major sin. Regarding this person who performs this action, if he commits a major sin; we say about him that he committed a major sin and we do not withdraw from him absolute faith. He still possesses faith, but he committed a major sin, so he is under the Will. And they say: No, as soon as he dies and did not repent, he is eternal in the Fire. They withdrew faith from him; he is not considered a Muslim according to them, he is a disbeliever. This is the difference between us and them.

Intervention:

Even lying, right?

The Sheikh:

Anything [major], this is called a *kabīrah* according to them. Naturally, I will come to you later; because this causes a big controversy among people. What is the major sin (*kabīrah*)? And what is the minor sin (*ṣaghīrah*)? How do we know this is minor? And know it is major?

I say it briefly, and later I will tell you the opinions of the scholars. You must be certain that regarding Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā*, you should not take a minor sin lightly regarding His right, saying: "This is minor." The minor sin, however small compared to what is more heinous, regarding the right of Allah, the small and the big are big and terrible. Meaning this is repugnant, *a'ūdhu billāh*, because it is regarding the right of Allah. But meaning one says to you: "This is bigger than this," comparing sins to one another. Meaning the one who committed this small sin, is like the one who committed the sin bigger than it? But regarding the right of Allah, all is big.

However, this is the definition of major sins: They are those which necessitate a curse, or in which there is a threat of punishment. Meaning the scholars have many definitions regarding the issue of major sins. But minor sins: are those which Allah pardons through seeking forgiveness (*Istighfār*), through some simple things. But major sins require specific seeking of forgiveness, and a specific thing. Even the minor sin is pardoned from Friday to Friday, these are expiations. But the major sin requires a specific thing and specific repentance.

So this is the difference between us and the *Mu'tazilah*, and between the *Khawārij* and the *Mu'tazilah*. One says to you: So the *Khawārij* divide people as follows: Believer, Disbeliever; no middle line. But the *Mu'tazilah*, what is the difference between them and the *Khawārij*? Although they agreed with *Ahl al-Sunnah* on the issue of division [definitions]. The *Mu'tazilah* divided people into: Believer, Disbeliever, and *Fāsiq* (Immoral). They said "*Fāsiq*" and said: He is in a position between the two positions (*Manzilah bayn al-Manzilatayn*). They placed the perpetrator of a major sin [there]. They did not call him a disbeliever in this world, meaning in the ruling of this world; but in the Hereafter, he is eternal in the Fire. Meaning they and the *Khawārij* meet in the end; the difference between them is nominal.

But what is the outcome of this difference? This difference has an outcome. The *Khawārij* who consider whoever commits a major sin a disbeliever, therefore they permit his blood, money, and honor. That's it, he is permissible [to kill] in the ruling of this world. As for the *Mu'tazilah*: They call him *Fāsiq* in the ruling of this world, regarding this verbal aspect; therefore, they do not permit his blood, nor permit his money in the ruling of this world, and treat him as if he is a *Fāsiq* Muslim. But if he dies, he is a disbeliever, same as the *Khawārij*. The difference is that the *Khawārij* used to apply the ruling of [disbelief in] this world upon him, by permitting his blood and money.

Therefore, the *Mu'tazilah* did not do that, they did not permit blood. It was merely intellectual sabotage. Therefore, they destroyed the Islamic world, and they were a severe danger. Why? Because the *Mu'tazilah* infiltrated the court of the State, and authority. So they arrived through Caliph Al-Ma'mūn. And Caliph Al-Ma'mūn is naturally one of the Caliphs of the Abbasid State, the son of Hārūn al-Rashīd. What did Caliph Al-Ma'mūn do? Caliph Al-Ma'mūn was a Zaydi Shiite, and was influenced by Abū Du'ād the Judge (*Qāḍī*) in the end of his life. He is the one who started the Inquisition (*Miḥnah*) of Imam Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal. He caused confusion in his brain, and said: The Speech of Allah is created. A great *Fitnah* arose, and people were tested, and they tortured Imam Al-Buwayṭī, Ibn Abī Nu'aym, Ibn Abī Maryam, and noble scholars; they tested them, and forced people upon an issue innovated by these *Mu'tazilah*. People continued to burn with the fires of the *Mu'tazilah*, at the hands of Caliph Al-Ma'mūn, in the end of his life until 217 AH approximately.

Then after him came Al-Mu'taṣim. Caliph Al-Mu'taṣim did not care much about these issues, but they influenced him, and the Inquisition continued. After that came Caliph Al-Wāthiq, and he also tested people. Ibn Du'ād was the head of evil in this subject. And of course, the issue was not just the issue of the creation of the Qur'an. He said: Reason is prioritized over revelation (*Naql*). They expanded into things, assumed assumptions, and made binding compulsions. Naturally, these Caliphs had the authority, unfortunately. They forced people upon these superstitions and these innovations which the *Mu'tazilah* innovated. Until Caliph Al-Mutawakkil al-'Abbāsī came, and restored the Sunnah, and put an end to this *Fitnah*, and restored regard for *Ahl al-Sunnah* once again, and Imam Aḥmad and others. And people began after that spreading the Sunnah.

So, the *Mu'tazilah* are destruction, and the cause of the secularism existing in the Islamic world. All secularists, notice, and Marxists, always rely on the *Mu'tazilah*. Notice, when the *Mu'tazilah* appeared, they wanted to declare Allah transcendent (*Tanzīh*) for the sake of knowledge, and they wanted the rule of Sharia, but they deviated, and opened the appetite of the secularists, the deviators, and the saboteurs. Therefore, we find these people... One says to you: "A secularist rejecting religion fundamentally," meaning he wants neither Sharia nor anything else. But when he relies [on something], on what does he rely? He brings you texts, and says to you: "Reason is prioritized." Therefore, they always write books, like Dr. Muḥammad 'Imārah, why do they always glorify the *Mu'tazilah*? These people glorify the *Mu'tazilah* even though they do not love Islam. Even the one who says he follows Marxism always loves the *Mu'tazilah*. Why? Because they prioritize reason over revelation. And they praise these

people, to the extent that they attack Caliph Al-Mutawakkil; because he supported these oppressed people from *Ahl al-Sunnah,* and restored regard for the righteous *Salaf* anew.

So this issue, O group, is not a historical process, and mere intellectual luxury about which we talk. This has outcomes and an impact, and it affected the Islamic world up to our present time.

So this is the summary. The dispute regarding the origin of faith, the cause of the problem, is that a group made action within the appellation of faith, and another group expelled action from the appellation of faith. The one who included action considered it a pillar, not a condition of perfection or otherwise. Action is necessary. Meaning, one who lives, for example, 60 years or 70 years, and said: "I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah," was born a Muslim, and did not pray a rak'ah for Allah, did not fast, did not do anything; what do we call this person? This person did not act, the genus of action (*jins al-‘amal*) he did not perform in his life. He was not praying sometimes and giving zakat sometimes, acting and performing and being lazy... even regarding this, there is a difference among the jurists. But this one did not act at all and died. Do we call this person a believer?

So regarding this there is consensus (*Ijmā‘*). This is according to the words of Imam Al-Ājurrī, Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Madīnī, the scholars of the Sunnah, Al-Dhahabī, and others. All these said action is necessary. And there are differences. Therefore, I will speak with you, *in shā’ Allāh,* in one of the lessons about a practical application regarding the issue of the abandoner of prayer (*tārik al-ṣalāh*); because the abandoner of prayer is a practical model. Why? Some people say: Does this abandoner of prayer disbelieve? And then they say: He does not disbelieve. And the difference in these issues? It is because of this difference in the appellation of faith. We will speak about the fact that there is a difference between one who abandons the genus of action, and one who acts and interrupts like the rest of the people; for example, he prays once, or interrupts once. This one's destiny is very dangerous, but the ruling of [abandoning] the genus of action does not apply to him. Meaning, so that no one misunderstands that we are saying about one who does not pray [regularly], prays sometimes and interrupts sometimes, that we have expelled him from the Millah. We are speaking about him, and the Imams are speaking.

And Ibn Taymiyyah explained it; the one who abandons the genus of action (*jins al-‘amal*), meaning he never prayed a rak'ah in his life, lived capable and had the possibility to pray, and we say to him: "Pray," he does

not pray; "Fast," he does not fast; capable and died upon this. He did not do anything of good in his life. This person is not called a believer, according to these conditions, the 'Illah (legal cause) which is in the Qur'an and Sunnah, and which the scholars said and mentioned.

So this is what we were able to mention. I summarize for you very briefly; the issues have explanations and complexities, but I hope the brothers have comprehended this. I will conclude in this section, regarding the subject which is the origin of the dispute: The sects opposing in Faith, what is their problem? The origin of the problem for them is two doubts (*shubhatān*), and these two doubts are the cause of the problem.

I will give them to you just without explanation now, but later I will detail them.

They said:

The First Doubt among all these sects, including the *Khawārij*, the *Murji'ah*, and the *Mu'tazilah*, all these except *Ahl al-Sunnah*, what is the first doubt? Their belief that faith is a whole that cannot be partitioned; either it exists wholly, or it goes wholly. This is the first doubt.

The Second Doubt regarding the reason for their expelling action or including action: They cannot conceive that disbelief and faith can coexist in a human. Meaning it does not work for one to say: "This is a believer and a disbeliever at the same time." Meaning some faith exited from him, and some disbelief [entered]. They cannot conceive that. Why? Because their definition of faith is the mistake. Their definition of faith is Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*). Meaning "I am affirming Allah, so that's it, I am a believer." Look! How can I include action in its meaning, which is prayer, or if someone committed fornication or stole, how will I say about him "believer"? Therefore, they said the best thing is we delete action entirely.

As for the *Khawārij*, the doubt also created a problem for them; "Either faith is whole... okay, how will I include faith if someone stole or fornicated? How do I say about him 'believer'? And how do I say he has faith?" A contradiction occurs, although they included action. But the problem of the *Khawārij*: They made faith a whole that cannot be partitioned as well. But they said: Anyone who commits any error, any mere sin, here faith is nullified, the entire faith is demolished. As for the *Murji'ah*, because they were confused about this, they said: The best thing is we expel action from the subject entirely, and we make faith merely either knowledge only, or speech only, and the matter is finished. If one died, our Lord will admit him to Paradise, and the story is over. They rested their heads.

This is it simply, meaning.

But I will now conclude by introducing you to the sects of the *Murji'ah*, just to give you models of these sects; because we will speak about them, considering that we will detail later.

Now we will speak about Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī, in his book *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*. Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī is the head of the *Ash‘ariyyah*. For information, this *Ash‘ariyyah* is a very large sect in the Islamic world, and naturally, it has a long history in Islam. But we are discussing them now regarding the mistake they fell into, and the calamity they fell into, which is *Irjā’* (postponement/separation of deeds from faith), and it is in the issue of the definition of faith. This is the problem, that they are *Jahmiyyah* in the definition of faith.

But Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī, the *Ash‘ariyyah* are attributed to him, although the man, may Allah have mercy on him, had three phases in his life.

Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī is the head of the *Ash‘ariyyah*, the Ash'aris are attributed to him. I will give you a brief about him. He is an Imam born in Basra, in the year 260 AH. He is attributed to the noble Companion Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī, meaning his grandfather from way back, so he is a descendant. His name is Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Ismā‘īl al-Ash‘arī. Born in Basra, and died in the year 324 AH. This Imam grew up and was raised as an orphan. His mother married a Sheikh and Imam from the Imams of the *Mu‘tazilah*, so he was raised in the lap of the *Mu‘tazilah*.

He is a great Sheikh, Abū ‘Alī al-Jubbā’ī, one of the Imams and pillars of the *Mu‘tazilah*. Meaning, you cannot mention the *Mu‘tazilah* without mentioning Al-Jāḥiz, without mentioning Abū Hudhayl al-‘Allāf, or mentioning Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār, or this Imam Abū ‘Alī al-Jubbā’ī. He was a very dangerous debater. So he was the one who raised Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī, and he stayed with him for long years; because he was his stepson, and was raised in his care. He was his professor and Sheikh. He used to accompany him to the mosque and to debates, and he attended the debates of the *Mu‘tazilah* with other sects. Especially this century was in the era of the Buyids, and the era of innovations, the *Rāfiḍah* and others. There was much argumentation with all sects at that time. So he was raised and grew up on the principles of the *Mu‘tazilah*, and on the method of the *Mu‘tazilah* in argumentation and assumptions which they used to assume.

So this was the first phase in the life of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī, that he was a Mu'tazilite. Thus, he was not raised on the method of *Ahl al-Ḥadīth* and *Ahl al-Sunnah*. Therefore, it was not known about him that he

stuck to *Ahl al-Ḥadīth* nor *Ahl al-Sunnah*. Even though they were present at that time as well; in Baghdad, and in Basra, and they were in Kufa, and this was the incubator of the Islamic world at that time.

So Abū ʻAlī al-Jubbā'ī was the cause of his exit later. The exit is the second phase. The first phase: he was a Mu'tazilite. Then once he was confused and sitting, and the *Muʻtazilah* in their way were discussing with people like this, the dialogues in the mosque. A man asked Abū ʻAlī al-Jubbā'ī a question, and glory be to Allah, if you do not adhere to the Sunnah, you go astray and get lost, so he said to him: "O Sheikh, is it permissible for me to describe Allah as 'The Rational/Intellectual' (*Al-ʻĀqil*)?" Abū ʻAlī said to him: "It is not permissible; because intellect/reason (*ʻaql*) comes from the hobble (*ʻiqāl*) of the camel; you hobble the camel and tie it, etc. So it is not permissible to attribute an attribute to Allah and say Allah is *ʻĀqil* like this."

This student was present, and Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʻarī was sitting. So he objected and said: "O Imam, if that is the meaning, then it is not permissible for you to say about Allah 'The Wise' (*Al-Ḥakīm*)? For why did Allah name Himself *Ḥakīm*?" Notice the cause of the problem of innovations is language, because they use language and distance themselves from Sharia evidences. He said: "Because *Al-Ḥakīm* is taken from *Ḥikmah* (wisdom/bridle), and this *Ḥikmah* is that of the bit (*lijām*), which controls the mouth, the mouth of the horse or camel. This is the *Ḥikmah*. So it is not permissible for Allah to be described as *Al-Ḥakīm* based on that, just as you say about *Al-ʻĀqil*. And Allah named Himself (*ʻAzīzun Ḥakīm*), and Allah is the *Ḥakīm*, from the Beautiful Names of Allah."

So Al-Jubbā'ī was confused; meaning he was dumbfounded. How is this? Meaning he sees it as dangerous. He said: "And what you say... and why do you refuse that Allah be described as *Al-ʻĀqil*? Why? Why do you agree to describing Him as *Al-Ḥakīm*? As long as the origin of *ʻAql* is from the hobble of the camel? The word *ʻĀqil* means tying. And as long as *Ḥikmah*: which is the bridle with which the horse is bridled. Meaning the Arabs take their words from here."

Therefore we say: "This is a wise man (*ḥakīm*)," what do you mean? You mean he puts the thing in its place, you put it in its place to restrain it. He says to you this is a wise man, meaning he does the act of the wise, directs it, binds it, and controls it. This is the origin of the word like that.

So he said to him: Yes. He gave him a very successful answer, he said to him: "Because regarding *Al-Ḥakīm*, permission is granted for it textually/legally (*sharʻan*). As for *Al-ʻĀqil*, if Allah had named Himself,

and described Himself as *Al-'Āqil*, I would have said it. But I adhere to what Allah described Himself with." Meaning Allah described Himself as *Al-Ḥakīm*, I am rewarded here textually. Meaning our Lord named Himself *Ḥakīm*, but He did not name Himself *Al-'Āqil*, nor any other names. Therefore, I must adhere to it and have manners with the Sharia. Therefore, we believe in what? In what Allah described Himself with. Here began his exit, and the method of the *Mu'tazilah* did not appeal to him.

How did he enter the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah*? He was confused. He wanted to refute the *Mu'tazilah*, but he had not learned the knowledge of the scholars of *Ahl al-Ḥadīth* at that time. The Ḥanbalīs, and some who were students of Imam Aḥmad and others, and the scholars who were scholars of Hadith, used to adhere to the definition of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. He did not interact with them much. Therefore, he heard about Sa'īd ibn Kullāb, who is the Imam of the *Kullābiyyah*. Ibn Kullāb was in the lands of Transoxiana (*Mā Warā' al-Nahr*), and Khorasan and these lands near Afghanistan. He was known at that time, and was famous for combining the two sides; meaning he is not upon the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, he leans towards *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and also what is between the *Ash'āriyyah*, a mixture. Thus he is not purely Sunni. But this was the best thing available. So he was influenced by Ibn Kullāb in his refutation of the *Mu'tazilah*.

Ibn Kullāb; some people pronounce Ibn Kullāb saying: Ibn Kulāb, or Ibn Kalāb. I heard one of the Sheikhs once say: Ibn Kullāb [with shaddah]. This man was shrewd, and a genius, unique scholar in debates. When he debated people, he would catch them, catch with the hook. He was like the *Kullāb* (hook). How do they say it in English? "Hook," the hook. You know the hook, as in the Hadith in the *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Kalālīb*: hooks, those with which meat is hung, things are hung. This is called the *Kullāb*. So they named him *Kullāb*, it has no relation to the manufacturing of hooks, nor the dog (*kalb*), nor does it have relation to the subject materially at all. But because he used to take or hook his opponent, snatch him, due to the abundance of proofs and the terror before them, and because he was very strong in debate, so they named him *Kullāb* for this reason.

So he was influenced by him. Then after that, this is the second phase, he was influenced by the *Kullābiyyah* in their methodology of refuting the *Mu'tazilah*. Then after that in the last phase, he got to know the scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, likewise the scholars of *Ahl al-Ḥadīth*, and interacted with them. So he changed and wrote his book *Al-Ibānah*. Naturally, some *Ash'āriyyah* try to create confusion about how he wrote the book *Al-Ibānah*, in which he returned to the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and said it is the last book he wrote. Even in his book *Al-Maqālāt al-*

Islāmiyyīn, he is fair and refers to the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. Yes, he has some issues, meaning he agrees with the scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah* on many issues in general, but there are differences. Do not busy yourselves with these issues. But he is a great scholar, he went through several stages.

The last stage: The scholars said that he repented from all this, and that he returned to *Ahl al-Sunnah*. The proof for that is his book *Al-Ibānah*, and the proof for that is his book *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* as well, it contains good things.

So this is the head of the *Ash'āriyyah*, and it is attributed to him. But the one who took up Ash'arism after that was his second or third student, Al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī, then after that Qāḍī Al-Bāqillānī, he is an Imam after him, then Al-Juwaynī and others. These are the great scholars of the *Ash'āriyyah*. But regarding these *Murji'ah*, he divided them into twelve sects. You have in the book of Imam Al-Shahrastānī, in his book *Al-Milal wa al-Niḥal*, he divided them into only six or seven groups. It is the same, meaning the same subject.

But I will give you models of these, we said those like: The Ghassāniyyah, the Ṣāliḥiyyah, and so on. Yes, we say he says thus regarding the *Murji'ah*, he says: "Mentioning the difference of the *Murji'ah*." Who are the *Murji'ah*? What is the meaning of *Murji'ah*? From the origin in language, the word *arja'ahu*: means he delayed it.

قَالُوا أَرْجِهْ وَأَخَاهُ

"They said, 'Postpone [the matter of] him and his brother...'" [QS. Al-A'rāf: 111]

Meaning: delay him and his brother.

وَأَرْسِلْ فِي الْمَدَائِنِ حَاشِرِينَ

"And send among the cities gatherers." [QS. Al-A'rāf: 111]

Meaning, I say to you: I postponed (*arja'tu*) this work: meaning I delayed it.

So *Irjā'* means delaying. So they were named *Murji'ah* because they delayed action.

And they were named *Murji'ah*: It was said because it is from *Rajā'* (Hope), that they enter Paradise; they gave them hope of entering Paradise, meaning. He said: Do what you wish, and in the end you will enter Paradise. Meaning we hope for Paradise for you, that's it, finished. Or that they delayed action, and this is *Irjā'*; that they delay action from the appellation

of faith. Therefore, he said the *Murji'ah* differed regarding what faith is. They are twelve sects.

The First Sect: They claim that faith in Allah is knowledge of Allah, and His Messengers, and everything that came from Allah only. As for what is other than knowledge, such as acknowledgment by the tongue, submission by the heart, love for Allah and His Messenger, glorification, fear of Him, and action by the limbs, it is not faith, it has no part. Love, fear, action by the limbs; all this has no relation to faith. Knowledge only suffices you.

This is a sect of the *Murji'ah*, among whom are the **Jahmiyyah**, followers of one named Jahm ibn Ṣafwān. These *Jahmiyyah*, followed in this what no one followed in the religion. They said and claimed: That disbelief in Allah is ignorance of Him only. And they said: That faith is knowledge of Allah only. Meaning you know Allah, that suffices. You disbelieved, worshipped the cross, prostrated to the idol, did anything in the world of the destructive sins, urinated on the *Muṣḥaf*, and this is dangerous speech, here you remain a believer! Even if you did these things; because you know Allah, you are acknowledging Allah, knowledge of Allah only. But if you were ignorant of Allah... ignorant of Allah why? You denied that there is a God, there is no God who sent Messengers, nor anything; then you are a disbeliever. So only this. But there is no heart nor otherwise, no submission, no action, nor anything.

This person died, and did not do anything in his life, no matter what monuments and idols he worshipped, in the end he is a believer. And the *Jahmiyyah* claimed: That if he came with knowledge then denied with his tongue, he does not disbelieve by his denial. Imagine!! What does it mean? One says to you: "I deny prayer, I deny fasting," he said that ("denies" *yajḥad*), meaning this statement. Even one of these *Murji'ah* said: He does not disbelieve, he is a believer.

And they said: Faith is not partitioned, it is all one block. But according to us, *Ahl al-Sunnah*: Faith is partitioned ("Faith is seventy-some branches, the highest is *Lā ilāha illā Allāh*, and the lowest is removing harm from the path"). Okay, removing harm from the path is not present in someone; did faith leave him? No; because faith is partitioned according to us. According to them it is not partitioned; you lose one, it is lost. It is one block, even among the *Murji'ah*; and that is because they do not acknowledge action. Action does not enter the subject originally for them.

And Al-Ṣāliḥī, this master of the **Ṣāliḥiyyah**, says: "Faith is knowledge of Allah only, and disbelief is ignorance of Him only. So there is no faith in Allah except by knowing Him, and no disbelief in Allah except

by being ignorant of Him," exactly like the *Jahmiyyah*. And they said and claimed: That knowledge of Allah is love for Him, meaning: submission to Allah. Here they differed only from the *Jahmiyyah*. The companions of this saying do not claim that faith in Allah is faith in the Messenger, and that one does not believe in Allah if the Messenger came, unless he believes in the Messenger. He says: Even if he did not believe in the Messenger, it is not a condition, the important thing is he believes in Allah. By Allah, rationally, how is this!! This is confusion and destruction in the history of sects basically. And they claimed: That prayer is not worship of Allah, and that there is no worship except faith in Him, which is knowing Him. Meaning you pray to Allah, it has no relation to faith, it is not worship. What is worship of Allah for the *Ṣāliḥiyyah*? Followers of this misguided one? Worship: means knowledge of Allah only; because worship does not mean obedience and action. Obedience: is a comprehensive name for all acts of good, but these expel action. If prayer is not worship originally? Then what is worship?! There is no worship in the religion ever, finished!! These people say that.

And there are the **Yūnusiyyah**, companions of one named Yūnus. These claim that faith is knowledge of Allah as well, like these too.

And there is after that a sect named the **Shamiriyyah**. It is the same speech; they claim that faith is knowledge of Allah, submission to Him, love for Him by the heart, and acknowledging Him that He is One, there is nothing like Him. This you find in some programs on satellite channels. She/He says to you: "O group! We are speaking about Tawhid only, we want to know to believe in Allah only, and unify Allah only." Therefore their focus is on proving Oneness. What, O man! Are you addressing communist people? Or irreligious people? He restricted faith to knowledge of Allah, that you believe He is the Creator of the heavens. These programs that speak about the greatness of Allah and Allah's creation, but notice! They do not speak about action, they do not speak about the other pillars, especially action. Even in these programs, they write books on the greatness of Allah and creation.

Therefore, governments warring against Islam always prefer these programs. Why? They spread like this: "Did you see the fish? Written on it 'Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh'. Look, this is a miracle! Look at the woman who turned into a lizard!" Just any talk. And after that people use doctored images in Photoshop, and laugh at the simple-minded. "One stepped on the Qur'an and was transformed," Allahu Akbar, and they spread these and they are all myths and superstitions. The man urinated in Guantanamo, and they put the *Muṣḥaf* in the toilet, and they were not

transformed nor did the earth swallow them. People tear the *Muṣḥaf* and are not swallowed. You will create *Fitnah* for people!

They say: "No, O brother! Sometimes it happens." Allah delays punishment. Do not be tested by this. He says to you: "The man who spoke in the cartoons about the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* burned," and they spread the news he burned and died. Look at the one who harmed the Messenger, and afterwards it was proven he went out and speaks, and one received an award from Angela Merkel. This is a mockery, O man, in the Islamic world!

And in the end he says to you: "Praise be to Allah, we are monotheists (*muwaḥḥidūn*)." Once a man named a Sheikh, this man says before a gathering of sects, and a dialogue called Interfaith Dialogue, he says: "We agree on one word, *Lā ilāha illā Allāh*." Okay, and the second half, O uncle Sheikh, where did it go? (*Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*) where did it go? He says: "This is what we can gather people with!!"

A‘ūdhu billāh, this (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh, Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*). Well, the Arabs would have said it; if the matter was like this, they would have said it and rested. "Say *Lā ilāha illā Allāh*" and that's enough.

They were acknowledging that He is God:

وَلَئِن سَأَلْتَهُم مَّنْ خَلَقَ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ لَيَقُولُنَّ اللَّهُ

"And if you asked them, 'Who created the heavens and the earth?' they would surely say, 'Allah.'" [QS. Luqmān: 25]

So they know that there is a God, so much so that they said:

مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَىٰ

"We only worship them that they may bring us nearer to Allah in position." [QS. Az-Zumar: 3]

"We do not worship idols, but they bring us closer to Allah."

Imagine! Sheikh Al-Turābī is the one who said that. He said: "We want to unite people upon *Lā ilāha illā Allāh*," and deleted *Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*. He says to you: "This is what unites people."

And he did not say "establish prayer and give zakat," and he did not say "Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah." The Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* says: "By the One in whose hand is the soul of Muḥammad, if Mūsā ibn ‘Imrān were alive, he would have no choice but to follow me." And in a narration: "If ‘Īsā ibn Maryam were alive, he would have no choice but to follow me." Meaning alive on earth—but we believe

he is in the heaven. But look: "he would have no choice but to follow me." Meaning he must believe in Allah, with the testimony that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah; the First Pillar: you disbelieve in these gods and believe in Allah, no deity worthy of worship in truth except Allah. And the Second Pillar, a body cannot work without a soul. This First Pillar: that you believe in Allah. And the Second Pillar: this Messenger conveying from his Lord. Therefore, there are those who say: "I get close to people through Oneness and Tawhid." These are the sects that were fooling people, because they do not base action upon it.

Some other sects: **The Thawbāniyyah**; and it follows one named Abū Thawbān. They claim that faith is acknowledgment of Allah and His Messengers, and they have sick opinions like this. And there is also a group among them who said: Faith increases but does not decrease, and whoever was a believer, the name of faith does not leave him except by disbelief.

And there is a sect after it named: **The Ghaylāniyyah**, followers of Ghaylān al-Dimashqī. These claim that faith in Allah is the "Second Knowledge" of Allah. I told you, what is the meaning of the Second Knowledge? It is Rational Deduction. Therefore, they do not hold with the faith of a blind follower; it does not work to imitate. And this speech is not what Allah obligated. Allah obligated upon every Muslim to utter the *Shahādatayn*, that's it, the matter is finished. Ibn Ḥazm refuted them, wiped them out and destroyed them completely, in his book *Al-Fiṣal*. He refuted those who stipulated this condition; those who obligate rational deduction. He said: "We lived and we live this for lifetimes, and people die, and we are still until now, and we did not deduce this deduction they speak of, and we acknowledge and are certain, praise be to Allah, and are believers by *Fiṭrah* (natural disposition) in Allah the Exalted, and we believe in this religion and have no doubt in it." Meaning they stipulated things for which Allah sent down no authority.

There is also **Muḥammad ibn Shabīb**, an eighth sect from the companions of Muḥammad, who claim that faith is acknowledgment. Notice, all of them say: Faith is knowledge of Allah and acknowledgment of Him. Sometimes some of them add, insert another term or another terminology, which is acknowledgment (*Iqrār*) instead of knowledge (*Ma'rifah*), and some of them add affirmation (*Taṣdīq*). Notice all of them have absolutely no relation to action.

I will give you an example of the danger of this speech, so we conclude with it and you understand and comprehend. Among these sects are those who said: "Submission to Allah is abandoning arrogance." They claimed that Iblīs, notice the matter reached Iblīs!, had

known Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* and acknowledged Him, but he was a disbeliever. Why? Because he was arrogant. Had it not been for his arrogance, he would not have been a disbeliever. And that faith is partitioned and its people vary in degree, and a trait of faith might be obedience.

Another calamitous sect. In a debate that happened in Mecca, between a Murji'ite as Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī mentioned. He mentioned: That one of the scholars met one of the major scholars of the *Murji'ah*. Look at what extent the danger reached! He said to him: "Inform me about one who claims that Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* forbade eating pork, except that he does not know, perhaps the pork which Allah forbade is not this specific entity (*‘ayn*). Meaning it is not these pigs we know now, another pig!" This one said: "I do not know that." He claims Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* forbade eating pork, but he does not know. So he said: "Is he a believer?" He said: "A believer."

Okay, we give you the stronger one. So he said to him: This man is Abū ‘Uthmān al-Adamī. Abū ‘Umar said: "He has claimed that Allah obligated Hajj to the Ka'bah, except that he does not know, perhaps it is another Ka'bah!"

The Qādiyāniyyah, the sect of Qādiyān: which is the invention of the English in the last century. What did they do? They made Qādiyān the "Mother of Cities" (*Umm al-Qurā*), and said about it Mecca, and made a Ka'bah for themselves too. And the Qādiyāniyyah along with some misguided sects [supported by] the English, who wanted to make Hajj [difficult]; they said: "You tire yourselves, and thieves, and roads, and the sea, and the ship, and things. Why tire yourselves as in the old times? Build a Ka'bah for yourselves, and circumambulate it, and the matter is finished." They said: "This person does not know that this Ka'bah is the Ka'bah, meaning maybe another Ka'bah." He said: "He is a believer." The calamity is that this scholar is told: "He is a believer!"

Listen to the worst: "He claimed that Allah sent Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, except that he does not know, perhaps he is this Zanjī (Negro)." A Zanjī man appeared in Basra, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī. *A‘ūdhu billāh*, imagine! Not the Messenger, perhaps another one, perhaps this Zanjī. Meaning he believes Allah sent a Messenger named Muḥammad, but maybe he is this (Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī) this Zanjī who appeared in Basra. Imagine what he said to him! This is disbelief (*kufr*). He who doubts this disbelieves basically. Despite that, he said to him: He is a believer. Why? Because for him the issue does not go beyond knowledge only. Meaning "that I know Allah sent Messengers only. That Allah sent a

Messenger named Muḥammad. It doesn't matter Muḥammad who? Muḥammad ʻAlī, Maḥmūd; the important thing is his name is Muḥammad."

The matter reached this absurdity, and clear misguidance and disbelief. Is there anything more severe than this? He says the Ka'bah is not the Ka'bah! The Messenger is not the Messenger! The pig is not the pig, another pig! How do I know it is not another pig? How do I know perhaps it is another Ka'bah? And how do I know perhaps he is another Messenger?

This is the outcome of the dispute, even in the appellation of faith. Notice what the dispute reached? So the issue, when we speak about the dispute in the appellation of faith, the issue is not an absurd issue, or a type of intellectual or historical luxury. We noticed this exists, and these sayers said it.

The matter reached, and even Al-Shahrastānī and others mentioned it, that they do not declare the one who prostrates to an idol a disbeliever. They say: No, no he does not disbelieve. There is a sect that said: Whoever killed a prophet or slapped him, he said: He does not disbelieve. Imagine! Whoever slapped a prophet or killed a prophet does not disbelieve! This is the effect. Imagine the matter reached this. Abū Muʻādh said: "He claims that whoever killed a prophet or slapped him disbelieved, and he did not disbelieve because of the slap and the killing; but because of disdain (*Istikhfāf*)." *Aʻūdhu billāh*! Meaning if he killed him, he is not a disbeliever because he killed him. And slapping the Prophet, meaning he slapped him on his face for example, is not disbelief. The man disbelieved not because he killed him, and not because he slapped him; but because he disdained him. Look! *Aʻūdhu billāh*, this is a disbeliever in everyone [eyes], outwardly and inwardly.

Mere mockery of the Prophet, mere killing in itself; one disbelieves by this. Mere slapping in itself, one disbelieves by it. Therefore they said: "He who prostrates to an idol is not a disbeliever in the form [of the act], but there might be an effect in his heart, that the Muslim or believer does not do it." His mere prostration to the idol is disbelief, and this has no relation to his heart. His heart outwardly and inwardly is disbeliever. This was said by one of the Salafi Sheikhs, O group! He said it in these days of ours. I do not want to tire you and burden you with names you glorify. They said this publicly, it is available on YouTube and written. They justify these heinous acts for these criminals who assault Islam and Muslims. He said to you: "If he prostrated to an idol, you saw one prostrating to an idol in this form, he said: I must ask him. The act in itself is an act of disbelief, but he is not a disbeliever who performed it."

How is this?! One prostrates to an idol, the act is disbelief in form, but he is not a disbeliever, and I must ask him and inspect him! O noble brother, may Allah bless you, why do you prostrate to the idol? Why do you prostrate to Buddha? Why do you prostrate to this stone? He says to you: "He might tell me an opinion for example!!" And this is just the operation; he is a disbeliever in voice and image, in flesh and fat.

One of the attendees:

Does the Sheikh mean one disbelieves by the mere act?

The Sheikh:

The mere act constitutes disbelief. Mere mockery constitutes disbelief. Listen to what the Qur'an says: They were mocking in Sūrah Barā’ah. They were sitting a gathering; if we recounted it in our days, people mock, *a‘ūdhu billāh*!! Allah the Exalted revealed regarding the hypocrites who mocked, He said: Because they believed, they were believers outwardly.

Meaning:

قُلْ أَبِاللَّهِ

"Say, 'Is it Allah...'"

They came apologizing to the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*:

قُلْ أَبِاللَّهِ وَآيَاتِهِ وَرَسُولِهِ كُنتُمْ تَسْتَهْزِئُونَ * لَا تَعْتَذِرُوا قَدْ كَفَرْتُم بَعْدَ إِيمَانِكُمْ

"Say, 'Is it Allah and His verses and His Messenger that you were mocking?' Make no excuse; you have disbelieved after your belief." [QS. At-Tawbah: 65-66]

So Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* named them disbelievers. Did we inspect their hearts?

There is something called Intent (*Qaṣd*). Intent is not a condition in everything you inspect. There are things that do not require intent, like the one who says to his wife "You are divorced." Do we say to him: "What do you intend? Did you intend to divorce her?" This is an absurd question. He said to her "You are divorced." She is divorced merely by him saying this phrase to her, the matter is finished. He knows, one speaks Arabic says to her: "You are divorced."

Therefore, the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, to put an end to this, said: "Three things, their seriousness is serious and their jesting is serious: Marriage, Emancipation, and Divorce." Merely uttering the word, it is finished. It does not require intent. The mere act, the form of the act. One prostrates to an idol, *a'ūdhu billāh*, you say to him the act is an act of disbelief. Okay, and the thief? What do we say? We say the act is an act of theft, right? Okay, and the person, what do we call him? Thief. One we caught red-handed in fornication. This operation is called what? Fornication, an act of fornication. And the person acting? What do we call him? Fornicator, actor. Okay, he who prostrates to an idol, did he act or not act?

One of the attendees:

This is a devotional act, O Sheikh.

The Sheikh:

Devotional or desire, this is disbelief. Do you know why you attend these lectures? To correct what you have.

The Questioner:

The issue of committing a prohibition... but the issue of prostrating to an idol, this is a type of worship and devotion.

The Sheikh:

These divisions, Allah sent down no authority for them. Leave this talk. I am rebuilding the mental structure for you. Why did we sit here? So we rebuild the mental structure, and say what is the cause of the problem? Because these people consider action a completing condition (*sharṭ mukammil*), not a pillar. This is the reason, O noble brother! I know their stories, and their size. And by the way, they are big Sheikhs. The cause of the problem for them, or the origin of the problem for them is fear. They read and know, but the cause of the problem is fear of the rulers. Therefore, they introduced these obfuscations. But because they entered, they went to extremes and wasted [the truth].

Therefore, I will give you an example. This speech I say is not from me. This speech was mentioned by the great Imams; Ibn Taymiyyah and others. But I do not want to burden you. These examples; they said whoever prostrates to an idol, whoever urinated on the *Muṣḥaf*. Is there more than this? They said: Whoever spat in the face of a Prophet or on the Qur'an. They said: This person does not disbelieve by this act, for perhaps he is a believer in his heart. But this act is a form. So I do not declare him a

disbeliever by it; because I do not know his heart, what he wants, perhaps his heart is believing. *A'ūdhu billāh*!!

I simplify it for you. If you put the *Muṣḥaf* under your foot now, what will you say? Disbeliever or not disbeliever?

One of the attendees:

It is not permissible.

The Sheikh:

Not "not permissible." Disbeliever or not disbeliever? Putting the *Muṣḥaf*?

One of the attendees:

It is not permissible.

The Sheikh:

Not permissible? Okay, I say to you: It is not permissible for me to eat chocolate because it hurts my teeth. "Not permissible" has degrees in Sharia. But I am speaking about Disbelief and Faith now. One urinates on the *Muṣḥaf*, tears the *Muṣḥaf*, what do I say? "He is a believer inside, his act is an act of disbelief." Okay, in the end, what is he? Solve the riddle for me. Disbelief or not disbeliever?

One of the attendees:

The Companion whose wife wanted to stab the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* and he killed her.

The Sheikh:

He did not ask her, he did not seek details now. This is another issue in applying the legal ruling; he can kill, and can establish the *Ḥadd*, and it is not a condition that he seeks details in such matters.

I give you examples only, so I can read to you, *in shā' Allāh*. Some brothers are victims. Do you know the reason for holding this course? The reason for holding these lectures, this course basically, the reason is that some non-Arab youths came to me last year, from the Woolwich area, and Wiltshire area. They are non-Arabs who do not speak Arabic. They asked me that there are some Madkhalis who were brought from Saudi Arabia. These people guide by the apparent guidance, and hold on to the appearance like this, but they stir up these doubts, and stir up rumors, and write reports here; to British Intelligence (Scotland Yard, and MI5), they write reports against these youths.

Considering that these English [authorities] are "rulers" (*Awliyā' al-Amr*):

أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنكُمْ

"Obey Allah and obey the Messenger and those in authority among you." [QS. An-Nisā': 59]

They discuss with these poor non-Arab youths.

Secondly: They say to them: "The issue of action does not exist, this is a completing condition." The best of them is the one who says that. And they transmit to them doubts of some of their Sheikhs, there are those from the "manufacture" of Intelligence. The one who manufactured the Jāmis and Madkhalis is Saudi Intelligence; so let us not fool ourselves. They are the ones who spread these doubts worldwide now and adopted them. However, the origin of this doubt came from the *Murji'ah*. We are speaking about the origin of the subject. Therefore, I said to them: No problem, *in shā' Allāh*, we will do [a course] for them, and indeed I dedicated a course for them.

Praise be to Allah, I explained the two books to them, and said to them: "Leave refuting the doubts doubt-by-doubt; because the method of refuting doubts doubt-by-doubt tires you greatly; because doubts do not end. Rather, rebuild your creedal structure, and learn the origin of your religion, and learn what the problem is."

I told them: I will not teach you *Al-ʿAqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* or otherwise. *Al-ʿAqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* you can take from anyone. But we will address the dangerous issues in the religion, which is the issue of Faith. The doubts came in the subject of the definition of faith, issues of faith, pillars of faith, the sects, and the cause of the problem. If you learn that, you will be able to fortify yourselves first, then you refute these doubts without us needing to sit, he says a doubt, and I refute it. We build our creedal structure, then after that these doubts come, and the scholars refuted them in the past. Most of these doubts, believe me, were mentioned by Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him. Those whom you use as proof against them, they respect Ibn Taymiyyah and glorify him, and glorify Ibn al-Qayyim, and glorify Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī, and glorify these great scholars, Al-Ājurrī and others. For information, they glorify them, yet they contradict them! Glory be to Allah! He speaks against their definitions of faith.

And Imam Al-Ājurrī says very severe words, he says: "He who does not believe in the three [pillars]..." Ask any Salafi Sheikh, now in our days,

from these specific Salafis? I do not generalize Salafism, I do not intend to offend them, I mean a specific Salafism. Ask about action, is it a pillar or a condition of perfection? He will say to you: A condition of perfection, and will not say to you: A pillar. Okay, the one who does not perform the genus of action (*jins al-‘amal*), what is his status? He will say to you: He enters Paradise, and he will tell you the Hadith of the Card, and he will give you doubts. I will refute you, and refute the Hadith of the Card, and the testimony of *Lā ilāha illā Allāh, Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*. All these doubts, *in shā’ Allāh*, I will refute them; because this talk is absurdity they took, dug up in the books of the people of innovation, and exported to us. But praise be to Allah, we, meaning *Ahl al-Sunnah*, are lying in wait for them.

Therefore, why did we rely on the two books of Ibn Taymiyyah (*Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* and *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ*)? So that no one claims that we are taking from just anyone else; meaning those whom you acknowledge, the Imams whom you affirm and glorify, we respect them too. So this is what we wanted, we take words from these Imams; Imam Al-Ājurrī, an Imam of the Imams of the Sharia, these great Imams. Our Imam Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr ibn Abī Shaybah, and Imam Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām who died in the year 224 AH; this Imam is the Sheikh of Al-Bukhārī, the Sheikh of Sheikhs, among the greatest scholars. His book *Al-Īmān*, Ibn Taymiyyah took much from the beginning of the book. If I read to you his words, he refutes all these sects, and confirms that action is a pillar. And Ibn Taymiyyah took most of this talk from the Sheikh of Al-Bukhārī himself.

Imam Ibn Ma‘īn, and Imam Isḥāq ibn Rāhwayh says: "I call Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* to witness that he is more knowledgeable in Fiqh and more learned than me." And Isḥāq ibn Rāhwayh is a stallion among the stallions of Islam, a mountain of knowledge, the great assayers of Islam. Abū Zur‘ah al-Rāzī, and Imam Al-Bukhārī, and Ibn Abī Ḥātim, and Al-Rāzī, and Abū al-Qāsim, and the great Imams. These are the ones who wrote on *Al-Īmān*. And those who do not come to my mind, I mentioned books on Faith, many books. Qāḍī Abū Ya‘lā al-Ḥanbalī, died in the year 458 AH; the Judge of the Ḥanbalīs, a mountain among the great Ḥanbalī scholars. No Ḥanbalī in the world can... he who reads Ḥanbalī Fiqh finds almost no issue except that the Qāḍī has [a view]. If "The Qāḍī" is said like that in the past, they mean Qāḍī Abū Ya‘lā. He wrote the book *Masā’il al-Īmān*, wrote the same title which I took, this *Masā’il al-Īmān,* and Ibn Taymiyyah took it and transmitted it as well.

So we are speaking about the generation of the Companions and about the Qur'an. And I do not care about so-and-so or such-and-such. We speak now with "Allah said" and "the Messenger said" with evidences. Imam Al-Ājurrī mentions to you fifty-six places wherein Faith is not

mentioned except with action. Then these come, and say to you action is a condition of perfection! Meaning an ornament, decoration, adornment, that is its meaning. Therefore, prostrate to an idol, rule by other than what Allah revealed... the reason, the subject is not the story of prostrating to an idol, its reason is ruling by other than what Allah revealed. This is the twisting and turning. Why? He says to you: Making idols, excuse me, this issue is a condition of perfection. No, my beloved! Action here is a pillar. If he dies and did not perform the genus of action, he is not a believer, he is not called a believer.

But what does "genus of action" mean? One has no time in his life at all... we are not speaking about the one who prays and stops and does [things], do not misunderstand this. We are speaking about the one who does not pray at all, does not perform action at all. They say, these people of the modern Salafi schools and satellite channels say: Whoever abandoned the genus of action, and did not pray a rak'ah for Allah, nor prostrated a single prostration for Allah, is a believer. How is this?! Okay, leave me aside, refute these Imams, refute these Qur'anic verses.

In shā' Allāh in the next lesson we will complete these topics, and speak about the outcomes of the dispute in these issues. I know that some things we say clash with some opinions, and clash with some opinions of fathers and Sheikhs, and some instructions and schools in which we learned.

Yes, I know that, but this is our religion. We worship Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* as He wants, not as our personalities want. Therefore, if a Sheikh or caller sees a wrong opinion, he announces his repentance, and says: "I erred in this," and returns to Allah. Therefore, no one is infallible in these issues:

وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَلَا مُؤْمِنَةٍ إِذَا قَضَى اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَمْرًا أَن يَكُونَ لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِمْ

> "It is not for a believing man or a believing woman, when Allah and His Messenger have decided a matter, that they should [thereafter] have any choice about their affair." [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 36]

I am not fanatical for my father nor my grandfather nor anyone else. "Everyone's saying is taken or rejected except the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* is infallible." Allah said, the Messenger said. As for "the Sheikh said," and he erred and did not provide evidence, that's it. But he strives (*yajtahid*) in an issue in which there is no [clear] evidence, he strives in an issue in which he has no firm knowledge base; yes. As Imam Al-

Shāfi‘ī said: "If you see my speech contradicting the speech of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, then strike it against the wall." Imam Al-Shāfi‘ī says this, and the great Imams say this. And our master ‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Abbās says: "May your mothers differ you! May Allah send down stones from the sky upon you; I say to you 'Allah said, the Messenger said,' and you say to me: 'Abū Bakr said and ‘Umar said'?!"

Imagine! Abū Bakr and ‘Umar, the Rightly Guided Caliphs, the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* ordered to follow their example. Despite that, he said to them: "I say to you Allah said, the Messenger said; you say Abū Bakr said!" This is ‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Abbās saying this. He says stones from the sky will fall on you. How do you contradict?! He says to you: "Actually the Sheikh..." People, *a‘ūdhu billāh*, have begun worshipping the Sheikhs!

More than:

اتَّخَذُوا أَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ أَرْبَابًا مِّن دُونِ اللَّهِ

"They have taken their scholars and monks as lords besides Allah." [QS. At-Tawbah: 31]

They said: "We do not worship them, O Messenger of Allah." He said: "That is your worship of them. Did they not make unlawful for you the lawful, and forbid for you the lawful?" So obedience to the Sheikh in disobedience to Allah is worship. Therefore, those who are fanatical for these Sheikhs are worshipping them besides Allah, without knowledge, and without realizing. Why? Because they obey them. Worship is obedience.

We ask Allah the Great, Lord of the Great Throne, to encompass us in His mercy. O Allah, we are Your slaves, sons of Your slaves, our forelocks are in Your Hand, Your command over us is forever executed and Your decree over us is just. We ask You by every Name belonging to You which You named Yourself with, or revealed in Your Book, or You taught to any of Your creation, or You have preserved in the knowledge of the unseen with You; that You make the Great Qur'an the spring of our hearts, and the light of our chests, and the departure of our sadness and our anxiety. Remind us from it what we have forgotten, and grant us its good recitation during the night and at the ends of the day so that You may be pleased.

O Allah, forgive us our sins, and our excess in our affair, and take charge of our affair. O Allah, grant us understanding in the religion, and teach us what benefits us, O Lord of the worlds, and make our speech purely for Your Noble Face, O Lord of the worlds. O Allah, remove from

us hypocrisy, showing off, and bad morals, O Lord of the worlds. O Allah, keep away from us hypocrisy, schism, and bad morals, O Lord of the worlds. O Allah, do not place in our hearts rancor towards those who have believed. *Allāhumma Āmīn, Allāhumma Āmīn.*

I say this saying of mine, and I seek forgiveness from Allah for me and for you.

Wa al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.

The Third Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allah; we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allah from the evils of our souls and our bad deeds. Whomever Allah guides, there is no one to misguide him, and whomever He leads astray, there is no guide for him. I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, alone with no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ تُقَاتِهِ وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُم مُّسْلِمُونَ

"O you who have believed, fear Allah as He should be feared and do not die except as Muslims [in submission to Him]." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 102]

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُم مِّن نَّفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا وَبَثَّ مِنْهُمَا رِجَالًا كَثِيرًا وَنِسَاءً ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا

"O mankind, fear your Lord, who created you from one soul and created from it its mate and dispersed from both of them many men and women. And fear Allah, through whom you ask one another, and the wombs. Indeed Allah is ever, over you, an Observer." [QS. An-Nisā’: 1]

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَقُولُوا قَوْلًا سَدِيدًا * يُصْلِحْ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ ۗ وَمَن يُطِعِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيمًا

"O you who have believed, fear Allah and speak words of appropriate justice. He will [then] amend for you your deeds and forgive you your sins. And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has certainly attained a great attainment." [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 70-71]

Honored brothers: *Al-salāmu ‘alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh.*

We are today on the eighteenth day of the month of Dhūl-Qa‘dah, for the year 1432 of the blessed Prophetic Hijrah. And we are also with the **Third Lesson** of a Sharia course titled *Masā’il fī al-Īmān* (Issues Regarding Faith).

In the previous lesson, we reviewed with you a model of some sects of the *Murji'ah*, and the sayings of some of these sects. We will choose later, *in shā' Allāh*, the detailed refutation to refute the *Murji'ah* in general, then choose the sect of the *Ash'ariyyah*; because practically it exists and is widespread in the Islamic world now. Also the *Māturīdiyyah*, we will speak about them, and speak about the relationship between the *Māturīdiyyah* and the *Ash'ariyyah*, and what is the difference between them.

But today: We will try to review with you, as I told you in the beginning, we are speaking fundamentally for consolidation (*tathbīt*), the definition of Faith according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*. In the past lesson, I read to you a text from the words of Imam Al-Ājurrī, who died in the year 360 AH, in his book *Al-Sharī'ah*. And today also we seek support so that the information is fixed, and the definition of *Ahl al-Sunnah* for Faith is fixed with you. Because we will speak today also about faith, about the strongest doubt among the *Murji'ah*: that they defined faith by the linguistic definition, according to the Arabic language only. And this is the cause of the doubt. And the cause of the problem; that they defined faith by the linguistic definition, meaning linguistic Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*) only. This is what the great Imams refuted; such as Imam Al-Ājurrī before, and Imam Ibn Sallām, and Ibn Baṭṭah. We will review for you some texts of these [Imams] who defined Faith.

Refutation of the Doubt of Defining Faith by the Linguistic Meaning according to the *Murji'ah*:

So I will review the doubt of language, and some things related to the issue of Faith.

Imam Abū 'Abdillāh ibn Baṭṭah *raḥimahullāh* says in his book *Al-Ibānah al-Ṣughrā* (he titles it so, but the original title is: *Al-Sharḥ wa al-Ibānah 'alā Uṣūl al-Sunnah wa al-Diyānah*). He died in the year 371 AH, meaning about four centuries before Ibn Taymiyyah. We told you that Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah died in the year 728. So we are reviewing now the Imams who were before Ibn Taymiyyah, so no one says that Ibn Taymiyyah *raḥimahullāh* invented for us the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*; no, he refined the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*, clarified the purity in this creed, and refuted the doubts of other sects.

A sayer might say: Why did he not mention, for example, these Imams in the issues of faith, the issue of the Shiites for example? Because they consider the Shiites to have no relation to the sects of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. We are speaking today about the sects counted as belonging to *Ahl al-Sunnah*, generally speaking, even though the term *Ahl al-Sunnah* has a

specific definition. But the Shiites contradict all these sects regarding faith, so the Shiites have no relation to these sects; because faith according to the Shiites differs from all these sects, even all the twelve sects counted by Imam Al-Bāqillānī, and Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī, and the author of *Al-Firaq*, Al-Baghdādī, and others.

The Shiites regarding faith: if you do not believe in the twelve Imams, meaning the Imamate of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and that he is more entitled, and this is a pillar of faith for them, then you are a disbeliever, you are eternal in the Fire. So we do not need to speak about the problems between us and them. Thus, you agree with them in a part and differ with them in parts; because these *Murji'ah* did not declare *Ahl al-Sunnah* disbelievers absolutely like this. Because among them are extremists and there are divisions. But the Shiites have no relation, they do not acknowledge basically the five pillars of Islam, or the pillars of faith according to them are not complete [as ours]. The important thing for them is that you believe in the *Wilāyah* of ‘Alī and that he is more entitled, and that these Caliphs usurped the Caliphate from him. Even the Twelvers or other sects; all these harp on this subject.

Imam Ibn Baṭṭah Abū ‘Abdillāh says: "The first thing we begin mentioning of that is mentioning what Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla* obligated upon His servants, and sent His Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* with, and revealed His Book regarding; which is Faith in Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla*. And its meaning is: Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*) of what He said and commanded, and obligated and forbade, of everything the Messengers brought from Him, and the Books were revealed regarding. And with that He sent the Messengers. He *‘Azza wa Jalla* said: 'And We sent not before you any messenger except that We revealed to him that, "There is no deity except Me, so worship Me."' [QS. Al-Anbiyā’: 25] And Affirmation of that is: Speech by the tongue, affirmation by the heart (*janān*), and action by the pillars (*arkān*)..."

We repeat it once again so you memorize it. We will keep repeating this subject of the three pillars until you memorize it by heart.

Imam Abū ‘Abdillāh ibn Baṭṭah, who died in the year 371 AH, said in his book *Al-Ibānah al-Ṣughrā* or *Al-Sharḥ wa al-Ibānah*: "And Affirmation of that is: Speech by the tongue, affirmation by the heart, and action by the pillars."

Janān means: by the heart. So the three which Al-Ājurrī and others said, these are three pillars. We cannot describe a believer if he acknowledged by tongue only and negated action, or negated the heart or vice versa.

And he says: "Abundance of action increases it, meaning: increases faith through abundance of action, and speech with excellence (*Iḥsān*). And disobedience decreases it, meaning: decreases faith, meaning faith increases and decreases, and it has a beginning and a start, then ascent and increase without end."

Why does he say "a beginning and a start"? Because all those from the *Murji'ah* who said Faith is Affirmation by the heart or by acknowledgment only; it means it does not increase or decrease, it is constant not moving. So [according to the truth] it has a beginning, faith might be weak, then begins to grow like this without end; meaning whenever you increase in good deeds, your faith increases.

Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* said:

الَّذِينَ قَالَ لَهُمُ النَّاسُ إِنَّ النَّاسَ قَدْ جَمَعُوا لَكُمْ فَاخْشَوْهُمْ فَزَادَهُمْ إِيمَانًا وَقَالُوا حَسْبُنَا اللَّهُ وَنِعْمَ الْوَكِيلُ

"Those to whom hypocrites said, 'Indeed, the people have gathered against you, so fear them.' But it [merely] increased them in faith; and they said, 'Sufficient for us is Allah, and [He is] the best Disposer of affairs.'" [QS. Āl 'Imrān: 173]

And He *'Azza wa Jalla* said:

وَيَزْدَادَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِيمَانًا

"And that those who have believed will increase in faith." [QS. Al-Muddaththir: 31]

So Faith increases and decreases. This is contrary to the *Murji'ah*, and contrary to the *Jahmiyyah*, and contrary to these sects who said: Faith does not increase basically nor decrease; because it is constant for them.

And He *Tabāraka wa Ta'ālā* said:

لِيَزْدَادُوا إِيمَانًا مَّعَ إِيمَانِهِمْ

"That they would increase in faith along with their [present] faith." [QS. Al-Fatḥ: 4]

And Mu'ādh ibn Jabal *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu*, the Companion, says to one of his companions: "Sit with us, let us believe for an hour." Meaning: Let us remember Allah so we increase in faith. And everything that increases, decreases; because some sects of the *Murji'ah* said what? One of them said: Faith increases but does not decrease. And some did the

opposite. No; everything that increases, decreases. This is the belief of *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

Therefore, Imam Abū ‘Abdillāh ibn Baṭṭah says: "Thus ‘Abdullāh ibn Mas‘ūd used to say, and the scholars after him adopted it; such as ‘Alqamah, Al-Aswad, Abū Wā’il, Masrūq, Manṣūr, Mughīrah, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘ī, Al-A‘mash, Ḥammād ibn Zayd, Yazīd ibn Zuray‘, Bishr ibn al-Mufaḍḍal, Mu‘ādh ibn Mu‘ādh, Sufyān ibn Ḥabīb, Sufyān al-Thawrī, Ibn al-Mubārak, Al-Fuḍayl ibn ‘Iyāḍ, and a group besides them, listing them would lengthen the book."

Meaning very many, this is their belief. Meaning: Speech, action, and belief in the heart. This is what Imam Ibn Baṭṭah said.

Then we will speak after that about: The outcomes of the dispute in this issue.

However, Qāḍī Abū Ya‘lā urged in his book *Masā’il al-Īmān,* on the name of this course, he is the Imam, the Judge, a great Ḥanbalī judge, died in the year 458 AH. He says in his book; he discusses just as we discuss. He wrote the book as an issue upon a question. He says: "Praise be to Allah and in Him we seek help, and prayers upon His Prophet Muḥammad and upon his family and companions and peace. You asked me, may Allah grant you good success, about the *Madhhab* of Abū ‘Abdillāh Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal *raḥimahullāhu Ta‘ālā* regarding the reality of Faith, what is it? And did the legislation come transferring it? And turning it from what it was in language? [He intends refuting the *Murji'ah* who said: Faith is Affirmation in language only]. And is the *Fāsiq* (immoral person) of the Millah, attributed to the religion, called a believer? And is increase and decrease possible for it or not? [Meaning: Does Faith increase and decrease or not?] And is the faith of all morally responsible people equal?"

The *Murji'ah* and *Jahmiyyah* say: The faith of morally responsible people is all equal. Meaning: Your faith is like the faith of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq, like the faith of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, like the faith of Jibrīl; all people are equal. Because the definition for them is Faith by the linguistic meaning only. Meaning I affirm that Allah is the Creator, the Provider, who sent the Messenger; so that's it, it does not matter. The Messenger believes in that and Jibrīl believes in that, and we are all equal! This is a false saying, because they expel action. How can my faith be equal to theirs? Is my action like the action of Abū Bakr? Like the action of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*? Like the action of Jibrīl? How is this?! It does not enter the mind of rational people. This is a very dangerous doubt for them.

He says that, transmitted the words of Ibn Baṭṭah regarding the reality of Faith, and said: "The origin is the linguistic usage, in which Faith was placed. Faith in the meaning of affirmation of the heart, containing knowledge of what is affirmed. Its definition in the Sharia: It is all apparent and hidden acts of obedience. The hidden are actions of the heart, which is affirmation of the heart. The apparent: are actions of the body, the obligatory and recommended acts. Aḥmad has stated this textually in places." Then he quoted the words of Imam Aḥmad after that.

But these people do not acknowledge apparent actions, nor even actions of the hearts. The *Murji'ah* or *Jahmiyyah* do not consider that the heart has an action; meaning it fears, grieves, loves, allies, humbles; they do not acknowledge that.

However, some *Murji'ah* tried to address this, and said: "Yes, the heart might have action, but this is an issue of effect (*athariyyah*); meaning an effect of faith." But they do not acknowledge action [as essential]. They acknowledged action of the hearts as a result of the severe texts, but most of the *Jahmiyyah* and *Karrāmiyyah* naturally did not acknowledge.

But we also seek support from the saying of the *Ḥāfiẓ*, the *Ḥāfiẓ* of the West and East, the great Imam Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr, who died in the year 463 AH approximately, author of *Al-Tamhīd* and *Al-Istidhkār*. This is a stallion among the stallions of Islam. Imam Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr in his book *Al-Tamhīd* says: "The people of Fiqh and Hadith agreed that Faith is speech and action, and there is no action except with intention —intention meaning the heart—, so the three are necessary. And Faith according to them increases with obedience and decreases with disobedience. And all acts of obedience are faith according to them, except what was mentioned from Abū Ḥanīfah and his companions: for they held that acts of obedience are not called faith."

This is another issue, we will speak about the *Murji'ah* of the Jurists regarding this subject later. To confirm the information, that what we say is not innovation nor odd sayings. This is the speech of the great *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and this speech is attributed to the Companions. These are the verses of Allah, that Faith is speech, action, affirmation by the heart, and acknowledgment by the heart, or specific affirmation. This is what we say.

I summarize the issue for you as follows: We said there are two sects; we must know this. Two sects opposing each other, they do not meet: The **Jahmiyyah** and the **Karrāmiyyah**. The *Jahmiyyah*, followers of Jahm ibn Ṣafwān, what did they say regarding Faith? Just to simplify the issue on the subject of *Murji'ah*.

Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī in his book *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* counted the *Jahmiyyah* among the sects of the *Murji'ah*; because they agree with them on things. But the *Jahmiyyah* consider Faith is what? It is **Heart Knowledge only**.

They do not acknowledge speech by the tongue, nor do they acknowledge actions basically. Therefore, they do not acknowledge prayers, nor one who violates these actions; it has no relation to faith for them. The important thing is you believe. Therefore, their extremists described Iblīs as being a believer. Why? Because he knows his Lord:

قَالَ رَبِّ فَأَنظِرْنِي إِلَىٰ يَوْمِ يُبْعَثُونَ

"He said, 'My Lord, then reprieve me until the Day they are resurrected.'" [QS. Al-Ḥijr: 36]

So he knows his Lord, so Iblīs is a believer in their view. But in the text (*athar*) he was arrogant, and other issues. Therefore, they described him with this, and no one described him with it [before]. Why? Because they relied on the linguistic definition; which is Faith meaning Affirmation only. As if he says: "I affirm that Allah the Exalted is the Creator, and Who sent Messengers," and finished, in his heart only. Therefore, the *Jahmiyyah* do not require that you speak with your tongue, nor even require that you testify (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh, Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*) at all.

Opposite to this sect, a sect opposing the *Jahmiyyah*. Naturally, they have principles and many things, I only choose an issue related to the subject of Faith. They have things regarding Names and Attributes, and deny the attributes of Allah the Exalted. They wanted to declare Allah transcendent so they worshipped a non-existent (*ma‘dūm*). They said: Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* did not speak to Mūsā directly. These are hollow names; when we say: (*Allāhu al-Ḥayyu al-Qayyūm*), they said: merely hollow terms. Living but not with Life. All attributes they stripped from Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* under the claim of transcendence! Therefore, *Ahl al-Sunnah* described them: "They worshipped a non-existent." Where is the Lord who does not speak? They said: Allah is not Living, Allah is not Willing, not this, not that... attributes of negation entirely. The issue is not just in the issue of the definition of faith; they have other calamities.

These are the students of Al-Ja‘d ibn Dirham; the first to say the Qur'an is created. One of the governors of the Umayyads killed him, in the year 105 AH, on the pulpit. He said: "Offer sacrifice, for I am sacrificing Al-Ja‘d ibn Dirham; for he claimed: Allah did not speak to Mūsā directly." And thus on the day of *Aḍḥā* (Eid), at the festival, he came down from the

pulpit, because they prayed in a far place, and brought the leather mat (*naṭʿ*) and slaughtered him. This is Al-Jaʿd ibn Dirham, who caused the *Fitnah* of the creation of the Qur'an, and his doubts are the calamities he caused as well.

His student Jahm ibn Ṣafwān, by his definition of Faith, innovated this definition and said: "Faith means **Heart Knowledge only**." Meaning you know Allah with your heart only, and speech is not a condition. Therefore, Jahm ibn Ṣafwān participated with Al-Ḥārith ibn Surayj in the end of the Umayyad Caliphate, the days of Marwān ibn Muḥammad; but he was killed after that, in the year 128 AH. Imam Al-Dhahabī said about him, and the scholars said: "A misguided innovator." He is the one who caused many tribulations until our day. He is the one who innovated such misguidance, until he was killed in the *Fitnah* of rebellion against the Umayyads, in the year 128 AH.

So the opposite to the *Jahmiyyah* are the **Karrāmiyyah**. The *Jahmiyyah* say: In the heart, internal faith only. As long as your heart knew the Lord and believed in Him, finished, speech is not a condition nor action nor anything.

Opposite to these are the **Karrāmiyyah**, followers of Muḥammad ibn Saʿīd ibn Karrām. This one also innovated a heresy no one from the people of Islam said. He said that Faith is merely **Utterance by the Tongue only**. Heart is not a condition nor otherwise. Meaning if someone said: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh, Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*), he is a believer. Heart is not a condition. Therefore, for him, the hypocrite is called a believer. He innovated a heresy no one said. He said about the hypocrites of Major Hypocrisy that they are believers. Why? Because they say: (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh, Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*). Meaning if he saw a *Zindīq*, in these days of ours, among those who insult Islam and otherwise, he says: As long as he said: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh, wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*) but his heart hates faith—because he is a hypocrite, so his inside is hating Islam, he says about him "believer."

Therefore, one of the brothers asked me about the subject of the *Zindīq*. Some scholars did not accept the repentance of the *Zindīq*. The *Zindīq* about whom they said his repentance is not [accepted] if he is caught for example [and brought] to the judge. If he said: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh, Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*), and I establish prayer, and I disbelieve in every religion other than the religion of Islam, etc. Those who said his repentance is not accepted, they mean his repentance is not accepted in this world; because we do not know him, because he is a colorful manipulator. He returned to the origin; he used to say (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh*)

before, and used to say "I am a Muslim" before. So those who said: "His repentance is not accepted before the judge," said: "In the ruling of this world." Meaning the penalty of apostasy is established upon him and it's over. But this person might be, in the ruling of the Hereafter before Allah... Allah is the only One aware that he is a true believer, and whether he truly repented sincerely. But who will know? No one knows except Allah; because he himself is a suspicious person, we do not know his state. Therefore, those who did not accept the *Zindīq*'s repentance do not mean the Hereafter's ruling, they mean his ruling in this world.

We return again to the *Karrāmiyyah*. The *Karrāmiyyah* who are followers of Muḥammad ibn Karrām, died in the year 255 AH. He said this odd saying. So we have two odd groups among the sects of Islam, regarding definition, opposing each other: *Jahmiyyah* and *Karrāmiyyah*. The *Jahmiyyah* said: Faith: "Knowledge by the heart only." And the *Karrāmiyyah* said: Faith: means "Speech by the tongue only." It suffices that you utter with the tongue only, your heart is ruined, your heart is anything, it doesn't matter. All are agreed on expelling action from faith.

Those who agreed on including action are: *Ahl al-Sunnah*, meaning *Ahl al-Ḥadīth*, the Companions, and with them the *Khawārij* and *Mu'tazilah*. But the *Khawārij* and *Mu'tazilah* differed with *Ahl al-Sunnah* regarding the issue of perpetrators of a major sin; these remain eternally in the Fire. I will naturally speak about the perpetrator of a major sin later in detail.

But what are the proofs of the *Mu'tazilah* and *Khawārij*? And the refutation of them? And the proofs of the *Murji'ah* too? Because the *Murji'ah* say: The perpetrator of a major sin is a believer with complete faith. Why? Because they do not acknowledge action. So they say: The man testified *Lā ilāha illā Allāh, Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*; even if he committed fornication, or committed anything, he is of complete faith.

There is a sect among them called the **Wāqifiyyah**: They said we suspend judgment on him; meaning our Lord might put him in Fire or not put him, we stop, we don't know. And a sect was decisive, they said: He will never enter the Fire, he will enter Paradise directly, *mā shā' Allāh*, he has a "visa" that he finished everything! How? The visa has fornication written in it, and theft and drinking alcohol, and everything you imagine, then he enters Paradise! He will never enter the Fire! Why? Because they expel actions.

But according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*: We told you: No, he is under the Will (*Mashī'ah*). If He wills He pardons him, and if He wills He admits

him [to Fire]; but He does not keep him eternally in the Fire. This is the opinion according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

The *Khawārij* are opposite to the extreme *Murji'ah*. The *Murji'ah* in general said: [If punished], he enters Paradise forever [eventually/or directly]. And these [Khawarij] say: He enters the Fire forever. Meaning two completely opposite paths. Do not forget these two sects, so you are not confused when we speak on the *Murji'ah*.

So we will remove these two sects. Know this: *Jahmiyyah*: Heart only. *Karrāmiyyah*: Tongue only. As for the *Murji'ah*: They are a mixture of all of them. It is almost a consensus [among them] that they expelled action (*Jahmiyyah*, *Karrāmiyyah*, *Murji'ah*) with all their factions, all of them expelled [action], including even the *Murji'ah* of the Jurists. All these expelled action. But the *Murji'ah* are types; some of them included the issue of speech of the tongue. Meaning some *Murji'ah* say: "Faith: Acknowledgment by the heart and speech by the tongue only."

When we refute and speak about the sect of the *Ash'ariyyah* specifically, we will comment on one of the points of *Al-'Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah*; because the brothers who study *Al-'Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* might not pay attention to the point mentioned by Imam Al-Ṭaḥāwī, and explained by Imam Ibn Abī al-'Izz, in a specific point regarding the definition of Faith. And because he is a Ḥanafī, *raḥimahullāh*, and because they expel actions from the definition of Faith, you find the definition in *Al-'Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* is devoid of action. We will speak about it, *in shā' Allāh*. Even Ibn Abī al-'Izz al-Ḥanafī *raḥimahullāh* mentioned the opinions of other schools, but he mentioned Imam Aḥmad, Imam Al-Shāfi'ī, and Imam Mālik include actions. As for Imam Abū Ḥanīfah, whom he follows originally, he expels action.

Therefore, most of the Ḥanafīs expel action from faith, this is their definition in *Al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* itself. Thus you must pay attention, and know the explanation or some commentaries; because this is important. Maybe you memorize the point, I used to memorize the point, there are 145 points in *Al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah*, and this is among the easiest and simplest books of Creed. But with some simple rectifications, meaning like these matters, and many commentators explained and rectified them, *alḥamdulillāh*.

So, we enter now into the doubt he stated.

A student:

You said, O Sheikh, that Imam Al-Bāqillānī is the one who recanted from the creed of the *Ash'āriyyah*?

The Sheikh:

No, Abū (Al-Ḥasan) is the one they said recanted. But Al-Bāqillānī, no. Imam Al-Bāqillānī who died in the year 402 AH, he has a book named *I'jāz al-Qur'ān*. This is a stallion among the stallions of the *Ash'āriyyah*, he did not recant. But he was a debater, and intelligent in confronting all the Jews, Christians, Shiites, and *Mu'tazilah*. *Mā shā' Allāh*, he was shrewd, and has a great biography. I wrote well about him, when I wrote an article refuting the Pope, (*Which of the Two Parties is More Entitled to Guidance, O Benedict?*); when Pope Benedict XVI was launching attacks on the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* some years ago. So I replied to him with an article. I mentioned in the beginning of the article the debate of Imam Al-Bāqillānī with the masters and rabbis of the Church at that time, and he wiped the floor with them. He was hosted by the Emperor and the Pope, and they brought rabbis for him.

And I mentioned words you can review, in the article available, which is the article refuting the Pope: (*Which of the Two Parties is More Entitled to Guidance, O Benedict XVI?*).

So we read the words of the Imam. Meaning when the Imams speak, like Imam Ibn Taymiyyah, these Imams were fair to these scholars. Meaning when Imam Al-Bāqillānī speaks, he says dangerous words in his definition, but they thought well of them; because they loved Islam, and that these were merely striving efforts, but they erred. They considered them wrong, but they presented things for Islam, and they were striving, and they were enjoiners of good and forbidders of evil.

You will find scholars from the *Ash'āriyyah*, despite their error in issues of faith and the definition of faith. But the problem came in the followers, and came in those who exploit these definitions to exclude some disbelievers [from Takfir], or some who commit destructive sins, or those who oppose what is known of the religion by necessity, considering them believers or Muslims. But the scholars were fair to them. Even Imam Ibn Taymiyyah, you find him fair to the Ash'ari scholars, like Imam Al-Bāqillānī and others of the great Imams, and he did not disparage them (*jarḥ*); meaning [saying] that they are disbelievers, nor that they exited the Millah. Not even the Imam nor his students, like Ibn Kathīr, nor Imam Al-Dhahabī nor others; they did not vilify them in the sense of declaring them disbelievers for example; because they say severe heinous sayings.

So look at what he said? It is a scholarly debate. But the danger about which Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah and others speak is the fruit, the practical application; this is the problem. Look! What does Al-Bāqillānī say in the book *Al-Tamhīd*, not the book *Al-Tamhīd* by Ibn 'Abd al-Barr,

he has a book *Al-Tamhīd* in creedal issues; because most of these master *'Ilm al-Kalām* (scholastic theology) and debate, etc.

Qāḍī Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī, and he is from Baghdad, or from Iraq, said: "If they say: 'Inform us what Faith is according to you?' It is said: Faith is Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*) of Allah the Exalted, and it is Knowledge, and Affirmation is found in the heart. If a sayer says: 'What is the proof for what you said?' It is said to him: The consensus of the people of language entirely, that Faith before the revelation of the Qur'an and the mission of the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* is Affirmation. And indicating that is His saying, the Exalted: 'But you would not be a believer in us, even if we were truthful.' [QS. Yūsuf: 17] Meaning: *Muṣaddiq* (affirmer/believer) of us. And from it is their saying: 'So-and-so believes (*yu'minu*) in intercession,' and 'So-and-so does not believe (*lā yu'minu*) in the punishment of the grave,' meaning: he does not affirm (*lā yuṣaddiqu*) intercession, meaning: he does not affirm the punishment of the grave. So it became obligatory that Faith in the Sharia be the Faith known in the language; because Allah the Exalted did not change the tongue of the Arab nor turn it. Had He done that, reports of His doing so would have been widely transmitted (*tawātarat*), and the motives of the Ummah would have been ample to transmit it, and its manifestation would have prevailed over its concealment. And in our knowledge that He did not do that; rather, the confirmation of the names of things, and addressing entirely according to what was in it; is proof that Faith in the Sharia is the linguistic Faith. And what clarifies that is the saying of Allah the Exalted: 'And We did not send any messenger except [speaking] in the language of his people.' [QS. Ibrāhīm: 4] And His saying the Exalted: 'Indeed, We have made it an Arabic Qur'an.' [QS. Az-Zukhruf: 3] So He informed that He revealed the Qur'an in the language of the people, and named things by their names. There is no way to deviate regarding these verses from their apparent meanings without proof, especially with the saying of generality and the occurrence of restriction (*tawqīf*) that the Qur'an was revealed in their language. So what we said is indicated: that Faith is what we described, excluding what is other than it from the rest of acts of obedience, of voluntary and obligatory acts."

This is the wording of Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī; this is the pillar of those who supported the *Madhhab* of the *Jahmiyyah*. Look, the speech is plausible; meaning one actually takes it. Therefore, I gave you the consolidation first, so you pay attention. Because when you read the proponents of sects, a problem might happen to you: that when you read the doubt, you think it is correct.

Okay, read the refutation of the Imams from before. The refutation of Imam Al-Qāsim ibn Sallām on this doubt, then the refutation of Ibn Taymiyyah after that. But also pay attention, sometimes! Sometimes when you read, for example, in *I'lām al-Muwaqqi'īn*, by Ibn al-Qayyim *raḥimahullāh* when he speaks and refutes the deniers of *Qiyās* (Analogy), he refutes Imam Ibn Ḥazm regarding the denial of *Qiyās*. If you read Ibn Ḥazm's words on denying *Qiyās*, believe me, if you do not have prior knowledge, you will be convinced by Ibn Ḥazm's words. Dangerous! He even has a book like this, or in *Al-Aḥkām*, he brings simple things... one who has no trace of knowledge might be lost. Therefore, there are some youths, or some people, who go read and are impressed by Ibn Ḥazm's words, and adopt Ibn Ḥazm's words immediately; because you did not read the refutation. Read the refutation while you know how to compare.

Therefore, you might read to me fifty pages, Ibn al-Qayyim mentioned the refutation to you. All these are refutations of, for example, Ibn Ḥazm. Okay, wait for Ibn al-Qayyim's refutation. He says to you: "Praise be to Allah, that's it, I am satisfied with this and convinced." He closes the book. This is some people, maybe he reads like this by way of selection, like exam days, isn't it so? He comes a day before exams reading two pages. These people... maybe the exam comes here, he reads a part in the introduction, and in the middle, takes parts, hoping he succeeds; because he is a failure, did not read, does not study well, takes by selection. Or some youths say to you: "Make me a summary," meaning summarizing a book for you...

A student:

The "Bırshām" (cheat sheet/summary pill).

The Sheikh:

Meaning they call it "Bırshām"; these summaries ("Bırshām" or painkillers), might hit or miss. But it does not work. Someone might have the book in front of him, believe me, and he never went through it before; believe me, he will also fail, even if the book is in front of him.

So the speech must be attended to. Naturally, the scholars' refutation of Al-Bāqillānī's words... I told you: I am paving the way for the speech, so you understand that the issues contain difficulty, in linguistic issues and so on. They rely on the Arabic language for definition. Notice the sects of innovators, even notice the Shiites, on what do they rely? Also on the Arabic language, and they do not rely on Qur'anic verses and Hadiths. And if they mention a verse, they interpret it with a corrupt interpretation, then rely on rational analogies.

You say to him: "This is a verse, this is the Messenger's Hadith, this is such-and-such." They do not rely on this. Therefore, he can always write a book of a thousand pages or two thousand pages, all of it having no relation to "Allah said" and "the Messenger said."

They said in the Arabic language its meaning is: Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*). So this Faith means Affirmation. So why does this Al-Bāqillānī say [this]? Meaning it means: Do not tell me that Faith is speech and action, no, Faith is Affirmation only, this is in the language. Or even if you said by speech, you are affirming as well. So all this is in order for them to expel action from the definition of Faith.

And they said: The proof for that is that the language was revealed before the Qur'an. And before Ibn Taymiyyah, the great scholars did not concede this to them, and did not say this speech to them. This speech is wrong. Do you know what it means? If you admit that Faith in the Arabic language is only Affirmation, do you know what it means? Very dangerous. It means that faith is complete, because they consider you affirmed, so your faith is complete.

Imam Abū ʻUbayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām, who died in the year 224 AH, I spoke about him and pointed to him before; this great Imam, who is one of the Sheikhs of Imam Al-Bukhārī, mentioned in his book *Al-Īmān* a refutation of this doubt as well. And Ibn Taymiyyah also took it from him; meaning Ibn Taymiyyah responded, developed it, strengthened it, and expanded on it with what Allah opened of sciences. So they said to him: We do not concede to you that Faith means, in the Arabic language: Affirmation only. No, Faith might be in the meaning of Affirmation, and might be in the meaning of Acknowledgment (*Iqrār*), and might be in the meaning of Security (*Amn*) and Safety (*Amān*).

So you say: The people of language entirely agreed. Who told you this? Therefore, Ibn Taymiyyah asked them a question: Who transmitted this consensus to you? Give us the Imams of consensus. Did Ibn al-Aʻrābī transmit the Imams of language to you? Or Abū ʻUbayd? Or did Al-Aṣmaʻī transmit it? Or did one of the great stallions of language transmit it to you? Are these great stallion scholars, like Al-Aṣmaʻī, Ibn al-Aʻrābī and others, and Abū ʻUbayd... all of these used to transmit and listen, and take the speech of the Arabs. These are Muslim scholars, from the great *Ahl al-Sunnah* meaning. So these are the scholars of language, and they are the ones relied upon in language, so these are them.

From where did you hear? They heard it from people, it was not transmitted with a chain (*sanad*), and no authentic chain came to us that there is a consensus on this subject. They said it was revealed before the

Qur'an, and the Qur'an came in an Arabic tongue. Who told you that everything existing in *Jāhiliyyah* (pre-Islamic times)? Meaning before Islam as a name, is it a condition in the Sharia that it be exactly the same? And the proof for that: They said: "Okay, you say Faith is Affirmation. We give you an example of the word 'Faith'; did the Arabs know the term Faith? Yes, they knew the term Faith. They knew it meaning Affirmation, meaning Security, from the origin of Safety and Reassurance."

And he said to them: Okay, was "Prayer" (*Ṣalāh*) known in the days of *Jāhiliyyah*? Does the word *Ṣalāh* have a meaning in the Arabic language or not? Its meaning in the Arabic language... they used to know the word *Ṣalāh*, meaning: Supplication (*Du‘ā’*). The Arabs knew that. But in the Sharia, what does it mean?

When the Qur'an spoke:

وَأَقِيمُوا الصَّلَاةَ

"And establish prayer." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 43]

What did its meaning become? *Ṣalāh* became defined by Sharia descriptions, and became restricted as the Sharia wants. *Ṣalāh* became not just supplication. *Ṣalāh* came to have intention, actions, movements, prostration, bowing, reading something of the Qur'an in it, and obligations. Meaning he who does not perform these conditions and pillars, it is not called *Ṣalāh*.

So it might be *Ṣalāh* in the Arabic language, the term exists, but in the Sharia it is not the term in its entirety. The Sharia came and changed it, and gave it a restriction, not on its absolute [meaning]. Meaning when I say to you *Ṣalāh* means supplication. Okay: Pray Dhuhr now, or pray Isha now. He says to you: "O Allah accept from me the prayer of Isha?" That's it, finished, a supplication. He prayed [supplicated] that our Lord accept his prayer from him, but did not pray [the ritual prayer]?!

A student:

The linguistic concept.

The Sheikh:

This concept, this is a refutation of them. Look, you refuted by yourself now. This is the linguistic concept. So the Sharia came and addressed the Arabs in their language, correct. But the Qur'an came, and the Qur'an is the authority (*Ḥujjah*), not the speech of the Arabs:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِن رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا بِلِسَانِ قَوْمِهِ

"And We did not send any messenger except [speaking] in the language of his people." [QS. Ibrāhīm: 4]

Yes, in the Arabic language, but even with restricted Arabic address, which the Sharia restricted. The word "Zakat" was known to them meaning Purification or Purity; but in the terminology of the Sharia, it came and restricted it and specified it to a certain thing. What did Zakat become? This obligation which has a specific threshold (*niṣāb*), and is paid at a specific time, and with a known amount, and verses were revealed regarding it in Sūrah At-Tawbah.

A student:

Before, it meant Purity?

The Sheikh:

It meant purification (*tazkiyah*). He says to you: I purify you (*uzakkīka*): meaning I vindicate/cleanse you. And your saying: This one purifies (*yuzakkī*) so-and-so, meaning he praises him, and cleanses him and vindicates him from crimes. He says to you: "Vouch for (*zakkī*) the brother for me." And you want to marry my daughter, I say to you: "Bring someone to vouch for you (*yuzakkīka*)." We use the term *Zakāh* now, but *Zakāh* here means what? That you praise the man, that he is not bad, and that he is not a committer of crimes; meaning you vindicate him, cleanse him from filth, from certain things, from destructive sins or something known customarily like this.

But when I say to him: Pay Zakat:

أَقِيمُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتُوا الزَّكَاةَ

"Establish prayer and give zakat."

Do we say about it linguistic vindication? Or linguistic purity? Or do we say Zakat which has a legal threshold, whose eight expenditures are found in Sūrah Barā'ah. This is it; so the linguistic definition is known to the Arabs, but it has another terminology.

This word "**Munāfiq**" (Hypocrite), was not known and widespread among the Arabs in the general meaning. But it is derived from the word "*Nafaqa*," and the Arabs know this. But the term *Munāfiq* was not in the common meaning; until the Messenger came, and the Qur'an came mentioning the word *Munāfiq*.

So why did the Arabs not object? For example, the disbelievers of Quraysh came and said to the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*: "What is this? You bring terms we did not know among our fathers?" No

one argued with the Messenger regarding this. The problem was that verses were coming down, captivating their intellects with the inimitability of the Qur'an, the eloquence of the Qur'an, and the sweetness of the Qur'an. So they did not object to the terms. But the term, they know it.

The word *Munāfiq* exists with them in the language. What does it mean? It means *Nafaqa* (tunneled/exited). So it is derived from the word *Nafaqa*. *Nafaqa* means exited. So "the frog exited (*nafaqat*)," "the mouse exited (*nafaqat*)"; meaning it went out. And sometimes we say this is death (*nufūq*). *Nafaqa*: meaning its soul perished sometimes. So *nafaqat* means exited. Therefore he says *Munāfiq*: meaning the one exiting from Faith and Religion. So the word regarding the linguistic term for *Munāfiq*, was it present as a term? No, but the derivative was present, which is: *Nafaqa*. Thus, the term might be present, but it changed.

The word "**Ḥajj**". Did the Arabs know Hajj? Yes, they knew Hajj, and they even knew it from the ancient Ḥanīfiyyah (Abrahamic monotheism); they used to circumambulate the Ka'bah naked, and women at night, and men at day, and so on. And they used to circumambulate, and perform some rituals, remnants of the Ḥanīfiyyah from our master Ibrāhīm. But the term Hajj came, in the legal meaning, and restricted it. It restricted it with these conditions and pillars. Hajj is ‘Arafah, and He stipulated for it obligations and pillars, and conditions and recommended acts. So when I say to you: Hajj, things and pillars come to your imagination, other than what was customary among the Arabs.

Like the term "**Jihād**" as well. It was known among the Arabs. The word: *Jahada*: is exerting capacity. *Jahada* and *Ijtahada* means: strove, exerted his capacity in the thing. Therefore *Ijtihād* or from *Juhd*: expending the thing. But as the term *Jihād* like this; this is from the excavations and carving of the Islamic term. Islam is what brought this term in this way. But did the Arabs object to the term *Jihād*? No, they did not object; because they know it, its origin is derived from the Arabic language, but it is restricted in Islam with restrictions.

Therefore the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* was asked: One of us fights out of zeal, and one of us fights out of courage, and this one fights for his religion, and for his honor, or zeal, fighting for his homeland, or for something. The Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: "He who fights so that the Word of Allah be supreme, he is in the path of Allah." And this is named: Jihad in the path of Allah. Therefore, nothing is acknowledged, other than the descriptions and restrictions which the Sharia restricted.

Even in linguistic translation; when you translate the word *Jihād*, you do not find a translation for it in the English language, in the literal meaning, except the utmost word they said was what? "**Holy War**." This is a very harmful word, from the linguistic perspective. Why? Because "Holy War" means: sacred war. Sacred war is a blameworthy term for them. This was grinding among the Christians with each other, they destroyed each other for the sake of what? Buying the priests; they were the ones ruling, and selling Paradise, and taking this one out of the Fire. And a group of misguidance distorting the Bible they have; so massacres happened. The word "Holy War": means massacres, slaughters in the name of God, in the name of the Bible. So this definition became bad now, as a result of the spread of Islamic and Jihadist movements in the world. They started translating the term "Holy War" writing it as Jihad (**al-jihad**). Can you define it another way? You say to him: Yes, this is a holy war, but not in terminology.

For example, when I tell you the meaning of *Ṣalāh*. When you come to translate it to English language, he says to you "**Pray**." O brother, "Pray" does not mean the meaning you imagine. "Pray": means anything works, idol worship, worship of anything. But this is an approximate meaning. Therefore, when you focus on the term, meaning your language is what imposes itself, your religion is what imposes itself.

Therefore Ibn Khaldūn used to say: "The strong is the one who imposes his language." He makes the weak imitate him, even repeating the term. Therefore we say now: Some translators now in books, when he says *Ṣalāh* he does not say "Pray," he says *Salah*; because the meaning has become customary and circulated. The word *Zakat* is the same story. He will say to you, what? You will say Zakat: "**Donations**" or "**Charity**," or how will you define it? All definitions of Zakat in English have no relation to the word Zakat, as a beautiful legal term. When I say to you the word *Zakat*, you understand it quickly, a term specifically of direct linguistic reception.

So this is a refutation and debunking of the words of Jahm ibn Ṣafwān, which Imam Al-Bāqillānī took, and Imam Al-Juwaynī and others. These who founded and established principles, and said: The people of language agreed. Where are the people of language? We are here, saying to you and transmitting to you the reports, that the Arabic language, even by this simple discussion... yes, it knows the terms, but this language is restricted by the Sharia. Therefore, Faith means Affirmation, even if we concede that its meaning is Affirmation only. It means Affirmation by speech, Affirmation by heart, Affirmation by action. But they do not acknowledge this. They acknowledge only Affirmation by the heart, and

the one who exceeds says to you: by the tongue. But action they do not consider. Even the heart, they do not acknowledge that it has an action basically; the heart has knowledge only.

So what is the meaning of Faith? If its meaning in the old Arabic language before Islam, which existed, meant Affirmation, and the Arabs used to say it meant Affirmation. So this definition is absolute. But Islam made it restricted by regulations and conditions, which is Faith. If its meaning is Affirmation absolutely like this... no, it is restricted: that it be affirmation by the heart, and affirmation by the action of the heart, and affirmation by the tongue, and affirmation by general action by the pillars.

So this is what the great Imams harp on, since the days of the Companions, ‘Abdullāh ibn Mas‘ūd and others, and ‘Alqamah and others. And these... Al-Qāsim ibn Sallām *raḥimahullāh* in the book *Al-Īmān* also harps on this, and confirms this. And Imam Al-Ājurrī, and Ibn Taymiyyah and his school, all of these.

Ahl al-Sunnah say: Defining Faith by relying on the linguistic definition is absolutely false. Yes, they acknowledge faith... if we concede to you faith in its linguistic meaning: Affirmation only, even though Faith has another meaning; it might mean Acknowledgment (*Iqrār*), it might mean Security (*Amn*), from Safety (*Amān*), but if we concede that to you as well; it is restricted. Therefore, all legal terms that came; like Prayer, Zakat, Hajj... all legal terms brought by the Holy Qur'an and the Honorable Prophetic Sunnah; these terms were known, or derived among the Arabs, but they are restricted by the Sharia, restricted by the restrictions of the Sharia. So why do you not acknowledge that? This term "Prayer"; was known to the Arabs, and it meant Supplication, and it has specific conditions and regulations, and specific pillars. So the Sharia restricted it and regulated it. I want you to understand, when an arguer argues against you.

I recount this to you, believe me, not out of historical luxury, and transmitting about sects. This speech is said by people living among us now. They say this linguistic definition only, and say the definition of faith is Affirmation. These are from the *Māturīdiyyah* and *Ash‘āriyyah*, and many of these emphasize the linguistic definition. Even the *Murji'ah* of the Jurists emphasize the definition. All these rely on the linguistic definition.

So we are not speaking about sects that have perished, that's it. No, these have traces, and have followers who speak, and have action, and have practical outcome unfortunately.

So this definition of Faith here, by the linguistic meaning, is false. And the issue... the definition that argues by language, we say to him: Yes, we argue with you by language as well, but with restriction. Meaning the definition of Faith in the Arabic language is restricted by the Sharia, restricted by what the Qur'an mentioned, restricted by what the Honorable Prophetic Sunnah mentioned.

Therefore he says: Look at the Imam reminding us of some issues. Imam Ibn Sallām *raḥimahullāh* said... and he is a stallion, I told you Isḥāq ibn Rāhwayh *raḥmatullāhi ʿalayhi* says about Imam Ibn Sallām: He is more knowledgeable in Fiqh and memorization than me. And Imam Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal says about him... he says: Allah loves the truth, people were infatuated with Ibn Rāhwayh (*raḥmatullāhi ʿalayhi*), he said: "Abū ʿUbaydah is more knowledgeable than me and more learned in Fiqh." Look at the testimony of a scholar!

O brother! Meaning there are some small ones, who steal some texts, and record them in books. One of these, believe me, gathered books for you... I saw him here in London. We asked him about one of the books. A writer on sects, and writer on creed, and writer on Tajweed, writer of compilations. And of course he does not attribute to sources; stealing them, theft like this. He came and we sat with him years ago, and we said to him: "Okay O Sheikh! Are you not an author in Tajweed? Okay, could you read for us? Start in Sūrah An-Nisā'." And he told us: "I memorize the Qur'an by heart." "Okay O Sheikh! Recite the Qur'an." By Allah, O group, we were sitting more than 16 or 17 brothers, here in London, years ago—and may Allah free the captives in prisons, and there are witnesses to this.

We were sitting, and said: "O uncle Hajj read!" By Allah he could not complete two verses. Not with Tajweed, this is with Arabic language, *Fatḥah* and *Ḍammah*. And this is a Sheikh?! "Okay, what do you read?" He said: "One who reads in Tafsir, and writer of a book in Tafsir." "Okay, what are the books you rely on in Tafsir?" Meaning in the exegesis of the Holy Qur'an? He authored a book in Tafsir, and says to you: "I read all books of Tafsir." He said: "I rely on a book of Tafsir." "What book of Tafsir?" To a book... he said: The book *Al-Fiqh ʿalā al-Madhāhib al-Arbaʿah* (Jurisprudence According to the Four Schools). Naturally, we all laughed. We said to him: "What is the relation of the Fiqh of the Schools to Tafsir? Okay, who is the author of the book *Al-Fiqh ʿalā al-Madhāhib al-Arbaʿah*?" Naturally he could not even mention Al-Jazīrī, who is the author of the book, even though there are many problems noted regarding this Imam.

And this one also, there is a brother who authors every two days; a book on Dream Interpretation, a book on Creed, a book on Sects. O brother, what is this? Someone takes the books of others? Fear Allah, shame on you. We sat with this one years ago; it was me, Sheikh Abū Qatādah, Sheikh Abū Walīd, and brothers Allah knows. I tell you names. We were all sitting together and tested him. He says: "I am in Arabic language." I said to him: "Okay come! Praise be to Allah, I have a trace of knowledge in Arabic language, come!" He could not, O man! There is nothing! Everyone agreed on him. By Allah, we advise you a specific advice... And he brought a recording with him to debate? It was a scandal! So they advised him, saying: "O brother, you could not... neither a beginning student of knowledge, nor a layman. We advise you to learn." And they pitied him, and said: "Cut the tape, O group, it is a shame, meaning a scandal like this. And he goes preaching to people, while he has no share in this." And they said: "We advise you for Allah, we are your brothers, and we will teach you etc.," and starting education anew. Until one of the brothers, may our Lord free him, said to him: "O brother, you are not a student of knowledge basically, you are a layman, and you keep presenting yourself as a Sheikh? With achievements! How is this, O brother?!"

You overreach and say we are people of knowledge. Meaning one bestows knowledge upon people which is not his knowledge, and fabricates and attributes to himself. So I said: O brother, the person who steals the knowledge of scholars, and is not a scholar; the youth must understand that this is not a scholar, and he steals basically, and this is scientific theft. Because some youth might be infatuated with this person, and imagine he is from the people of knowledge. And they print books, one keeps breeding books. How, O man, could you write all these books?! Because unfortunately the Internet and these encyclopedias recorded on computer, "Tom, Dick, and Harry" enter, do "cut & paste," enter and work, and author a nice book for you like this, and he will dance at every carnival!

Is this knowledge? Where is the pleasure of books and pleasure of research here? And where is your personality in the book? Will I sit gathering? Where are you? Where is your opinion? Where is the scientific argument? These are books. You read a book, you must find the breath of the scholar in it, his breath as a personality. I put this just [as a note], and the intelligent understands by a signal.

What did Abū 'Ubayd ibn Sallām *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* say? He said: "To proceed; if you ask me about Faith, and the difference of the Ummah regarding its completion, its increase and its decrease..." Remember that you loved to know what *Ahl al-Sunnah* are upon regarding that, and what is the argument against whoever separated from them in it.

Look O brother, this speech the man wrote before 224 AH. He died in the year 224 AH, meaning he wrote it before that. Meaning there are Imams writing. I always read words of Ibn Taymiyyah, from the book *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* by Ibn Taymiyyah. This book *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl*, reading it is enjoyment, meaning a masterpiece of Sharia knowledge, in defending the Messenger of Allah, and refuting evidences. He wrote this in his youth, he did not write it when he was old.

Enjoy what the scholars said. This is before Ibn Taymiyyah matured for example, before these matured. They wrote it also in their youth. Like the book *Zād al-Ma'ād*, Ibn al-Qayyim wrote it like this, on a journey in travel, most of it from his head.

After that he spoke about Faith, then mentioned after that the definition of Faith according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*, as we told you. I do not want to go too far. But he clarifies a dangerous issue now, which is the issue of **Complete Faith**. Meaning if we proceeded on the subject of Arabic language, only for Affirmation; meaning all people become equal?! No, they are not equal. Who told you they are equal? Okay, those who believed in the days of early Mission.

Those who believed in the days of the Messenger's mission in the beginning, prayers were not obligated on them, prayer was not obligated on them, fasting was not obligated on them, jihad was not obligated on them, all these complete legislations were not obligated on them. Rather, some of them believed only with (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh, wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*) and died. So not all people are equal. This one who died... okay, after that the one who was praying... when they went to Medina, he says: "When people turned to Islam, and their desire for it became good; Allah increased them in their faith, by turning the prayer towards the Ka'bah." Did they not use to pray towards Bayt al-Maqdis (Jerusalem)? After that He turned them towards the Ka'bah to which we pray now, after it was towards Bayt al-Maqdis.

So He said:

قَدْ نَرَىٰ تَقَلُّبَ وَجْهِكَ فِي السَّمَاءِ ۖ فَلَنُوَلِّيَنَّكَ قِبْلَةً تَرْضَاهَا ۚ فَوَلِّ وَجْهَكَ شَطْرَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ ۚ وَحَيْثُ مَا كُنتُمْ فَوَلُّوا وُجُوهَكُمْ شَطْرَهُ

"We have certainly seen the turning of your face, [O Muḥammad], toward the heaven, and We will surely turn you to a qiblah with which you will be pleased. So turn your face toward al-Masjid al-

Haram. And wherever you [believers] are, turn your faces toward it." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 144]

That's it, a Qur'anic command now. But before that they were praying to the first Qiblah, which is Bayt al-Maqdis. Then He addressed them while in Medina by the name of the previous Faith, He said: "O you who have believed" (*Yā ayyuhā alladhīna āmanū*); in everything He commanded them and forbade them. Notice in the term Faith: "O you who have believed."

He said in command:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا ارْكَعُوا وَاسْجُدُوا

"O you who have believed, bow and prostrate." [QS. Al-Ḥajj: 77]

And He said:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِذَا قُمْتُمْ إِلَى الصَّلَاةِ فَاغْسِلُوا وُجُوهَكُمْ وَأَيْدِيَكُمْ إِلَى الْمَرَافِقِ

"O you who have believed, when you rise to [perform] prayer, wash your faces and your hands to the elbows." [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 6]

And He said in prohibition:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَأْكُلُوا الرِّبَا

"O you who have believed, do not consume usury." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 130]

Here are details of legislation. Based on this, every address in which there was a command or prohibition for them after the Hijrah... He named them by this name due to Acknowledgment (*Iqrār*) alone; since there was no other obligation besides it. Meaning He named them thus. When the laws were revealed after this, the obligation of the first became incumbent upon them equally, there is no difference between them; because all of it is from Allah, by His command and by His obligation. If upon the turning of the Qiblah to the Ka'bah, they refused and rejected, said: "We used to pray only at Bayt al-Maqdis, we do not want this new Qiblah." If they refused to pray towards it, and held on to that Faith, said: "We are believers from before"; meaning the Affirmational Faith from before, whose name stuck to them, "Since you are a believer?" They intend this. So it sticks to you until your death. And the Qiblah they were upon... that would not have availed them anything. And it would have been a nullification of their acknowledgment, if they said: "No, we were believers from before, we

prayed to Bayt al-Maqdis, we will not pray to the Sacred House now, in which is the Ka'bah in Mecca." It would have been a nullification of the acknowledgment, meaning they became disbelievers. Because the first obedience is not more entitled than the second obedience. The One who commanded you with the first obedience is the One who commanded you with the second obedience. Why do you refuse this?

So do not say all people are equal in faith, that they do not differ. Faith in the Hijrah differs from Faith after that. People were believers according to the extent that came to them from the Sharia. But if the one who came after the Hijrah in Medina believed in the same thing the [early one] believed in, said: "I will adhere as in the days of the Messenger only before the Hijrah, meaning I will believe as the people of Mecca believed only." Then what do we say to him? Is this a believer? Do we describe him with Faith? No, because he will not pray to the Ka'bah, he will not fast. All these obligations were obligated after the second year of Hijrah.

One [woman] says to you: "I will not wear hijab." There was no hijab until the year 5 AH. Meaning the obligation of hijab was not revealed except with Sūrah Al-Aḥzāb in the fifth year of Hijrah. Meaning she says to you: "What? No, I will remain on the old way, I will not take Sūrah Al-Aḥzāb." Therefore they said: When they responded to Allah and His Messenger regarding accepting prayer, like their response to Acknowledgment, both became together; the two stages together were Faith on that day, since prayer was added to Acknowledgment.

And the witness that prayer is from Faith is the Hadith when they said: "O Messenger of Allah, our brothers who died and were praying towards Bayt al-Maqdis? Where did their deeds go?" Meaning, are they believers or not believers? The saying of Allah the Exalted was revealed:

وَمَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُضِيعَ إِيمَانَكُمْ

"And never would Allah have caused you to lose your faith." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 143]

"Your faith" here: means your prayer, meaning action, not the heart and heart knowledge.

Some of those who say: "They called Faith regarding believers by speech only; when they heard Allah naming them believers, they affirmed faith for them entirely with its completeness." Meaning they said: What? They were believers, so they are believers with its completeness from the first day. Okay, the one who comes after that, and obligations were obligated, and things were abrogated, what do we say about them?

Therefore, people are not equal in faith. Faith differs from one person to another, and from one time to another.

Of course, we will have to stop at this amount regarding this subject. In the next lesson, *in shā' Allāh*, we will begin by refuting some doubts, then after that we present to you the debate of some Imams; like Imam Abū Thawr when he debated the *Murji'ah*, and with what did he silence them? He had a very good text, and we will read it to you, *in shā' Allāh*, so you understand how the scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah* used to converse with the *Murji'ah* and debate them. And Imam Aḥmad has good debates, and very valuable treatises on this, and he and the great Imams like Al-Awzā‘ī and others were victorious, may Allah have mercy on them all.

Intervention:

May Allah bless you, O Sheikh. We understood that the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah* and the scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah* is that Faith is Affirmation in the heart, Speech by the tongue, and Action by the pillars. And this is the correct saying of the scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah* regarding the definition of Faith. You mentioned that the scholars of other sects, who said that Faith is Affirmation...

The Sheikh:

In language only.

Intervention:

Assuming that the scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah* praise scholars for their good intention, what is their ruling? Are they counted among the people of misguidance? Or do we consider that he strove in the issue and erred? So what would be the ruling of these scholars who erred in this issue? Although the scholars praise them, and you said they are a type of worshippers and... this is one issue. The other issue: The issue of the *Jahmiyyah* and *Mu‘tazilah*, are they the same sect or different sects?

The Sheikh:

No, the *Mu‘tazilah* differ completely from the *Jahmiyyah*; the *Mu‘tazilah* are against the *Jahmiyyah*, because the *Mu‘tazilah* in their definition of Faith believe in the three pillars; by the heart, by the tongue, and by action. And we told you: The *Khawārij* and *Mu‘tazilah* agree with *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Ḥadīth* in including action in Faith.

Intervention:

In the issue of Faith; when you mentioned in the other material, which is negating the Attributes...

The Sheikh:

Yes, they have interpretations, but they differ to a large extent.

We suffice with this question, you did well, may Allah bless you. regarding this question, the scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah* are fair even with their opponents. As I told you, and some texts will come to you, *in shā' Allāh*, regarding their fairness to these scholars. You will find them writing a comprehensive biography; and they say: "The stallion scholar, the ascetic, the worshipper, who was a towering figure against the people of innovation," and so on. But they say out of honesty: "But he had an innovation in this." Meaning, for example, when we say Imam Al-Bāqillānī, he was an Imam supporting Islam, and he believed that this is the true *Madhhab* in his opinion, and that this supports the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. He refuted the Shiites and refuted the *Mu'tazilah*.

Because all these sects appeared in his century strongly, and the debates were strong, and he refuted the Jews and Christians. You cannot say: "This one is not praised for an act." Rather they thanked him and praised him for doing that, but they clarified his error. So it is said for example: "This is a great Imam, and a jurist among the great jurists of the Muslims, but he had an innovation in the issues of Faith, he had an innovation in the issue of Names and Attributes." Meaning you restrict the subject. You cannot, for example, compare Imam Al-Bāqillānī with Imam Al-Qāsim ibn Sallām for example; because this is a truly pure Sheikh, an Imam of pure creed, he was against these people. So naturally you will say this is a stallion Imam, among the stallions of *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

Imam Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal for example; you cannot say [he erred] in creedal issues. But Imam Al-Bāqillānī and Al-Juwaynī, and others among these famous Imams, even Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī in his phases...

Therefore you say: This is an Imam, but he has errors in such-and-such. Therefore even the great Imams; notice Imam Ibn 'Aqīl al-Ḥanbalī, this is a stallion among the stallions, among the great professors of the Ḥanbalīs. Despite that, Ibn Taymiyyah criticized him in some creedal issues, and some issues of interpretation, and some issues in Names and Attributes; some definitions by which Ibn 'Aqīl was influenced in the past. He is a Ḥanbalī Imam, and being a Ḥanbalī does not mean you say he is infallible. Ibn Taymiyyah discussed some of the great Imams.

Okay, this Imam Al-Saffārīnī wrote a book named *Lawāmi' al-Anwār*. This Imam Al-Saffārīnī died in the year 1188 AH. This man was from Saffārīn, a village among the villages of Nablus. He is a Ḥanbalī Imam, and he has a very large poem, more than 200 verses; in which he

versified the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in poetry. Commentators explained it, like Sheikh Imam Al-Sa‘dī; but they rectified some issues regarding him, even in the subject of Names and Attributes. Some scholars rectified him, like Sheikh ‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Abā Baṭīn and other scholars who explained *Lawāmi‘ al-Anwār*.

So, is no one infallible in this? Meaning the encyclopedic scholar, this absolute *Mujtahid*, does not exist. It is said to you: Imam Al-Dhahabī praised Imam Ibn Ḥazm. Ibn Ḥazm is a sea with no shore. His book *Al-Muḥallā* is an encyclopedia, the book *Al-Iḥkām* by Ibn Ḥazm, *Al-Fiṣal*; this is a very great encyclopedic scholar. But he fell into errors, although he was a Ẓāhirī (Literalist), but unfortunately he interpreted the Names and Attributes, and fell into very dangerous things. So they said: We do not declare him a disbeliever nor declare him astray, rather he was interpreting (*muta’awwil*), and he was a doer of good. Look at the fairness of Imam Al-Dhahabī! He is speaking about Ibn Ḥazm *raḥimahullāh* who died in the year 456 AH[1].

So Ibn Ḥazm has very dangerous issues; despite that, the Imams were fair to him. And thus the scholars were fair to each other. Therefore, I hope from the brothers to understand when we criticize. The problem regarding these scholars is that the generations that came after them destroyed the world. They took their words and adopted them, claiming that this great Imam Al-Bāqillānī said this, Imam Al-Juwaynī said this. And those living amongst us now interpret that.

Although these people, frankly, were striving (*yujāhidūn*), and were guarding the frontiers (*yurābiṭūn*), and were enjoiners of good and forbidders of evil. Most of the Imams from the fourth Hijri century to our present time, almost most of the prominent scholars are Ash'aris, those who fought Jihad. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī, this great hero who liberated Palestine, and ‘Imād al-Dīn Zankī, and Nūr al-Dīn Zankī, and their father Āq Sunqur, and all those who carried the torch of Jihad, Sayf al-Dīn Quṭuz; they had a galaxy of scholars, they were Ash'aris. The world was spread with Ash'arism, unfortunately.

Therefore, you cannot erase the history of Islam and Muslims. We say what is the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf*? The *Madhhab* of the *Salaf*: we find this mostly in the *Salaf* of the first centuries. Then after that deviation began from the fourth century. Yes, its traces started in the second century, or in the last days of the Companions; when the *Qadariyyah* appeared, and

[1] Correct date is 456 AH, text says 1064 Hijri which seems wrong in transcript. Ibn Hazm died 456 AH. 1064 is CE

Ma'bad al-Juhanī, when 'Abdullāh ibn 'Umar *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* refuted them. But when did the strength of the people of innovation appear? Since the fourth Hijri century and afterwards.

But we are fair and say: This is a good scholar in such-and-such, but he has an innovation in such-and-such, he erred in such-and-such. And this does not decrease anything from his worth. So I do not mislead the youth and confuse them. When the brother says: You say Al-Bāqillānī. I say to you: No, Al-Bāqillānī is great. But pay attention when you read his works; in jurisprudence issues no problem, issues of refutations against Jews, Christians, and *Mu'tazilah* no problem, good. But when you come to his definition of issues in Faith, issues in Names and Attributes, and "The Most Merciful rose over the Throne," these subjects contain clear misguidance for them. So you must be wary of these as well.

But after that take from him what benefits you. We are creating immunity; meaning you know the red dots with the scholar, take from him the green dots about which scholars did not speak, or in which he agreed with most scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, but differed with them in specific issues.

Therefore, we are speaking about specific issues in particular. Therefore, I tell you we chose *Masā'il fī al-Īmān* (Issues Regarding Faith), and not "All Issues of Faith"; because there are branches or issues in the religion that are many. I take the important issues in Faith, which you ought to know, and which have an impact on reality. What we are talking about has an impact on reality, and the proof is this question, may Allah bless you.

We ask Allah the Great, Lord of the Noble Throne, to encompass us in His mercy.

I say this saying of mine, and I seek forgiveness from Allah the Great for me and for you.

The Fourth Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allah; we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allah from the evils of our souls and our bad deeds. Whomever Allah guides, there is no one to misguide him, and whomever He leads astray, there is no guide for him. I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, alone with no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ تُقَاتِهِ وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُم مُّسْلِمُونَ

"O you who have believed, fear Allah as He should be feared and do not die except as Muslims." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 102]

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُم مِّن نَّفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا وَبَثَّ مِنْهُمَا رِجَالًا كَثِيرًا وَنِسَاءً ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا

"O mankind, fear your Lord, who created you from one soul and created from it its mate and dispersed from both of them many men and women. And fear Allah, through whom you ask one another, and the wombs. Indeed Allah is ever, over you, an Observer." [QS. An-Nisā’: 1]

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَقُولُوا قَوْلًا سَدِيدًا * يُصْلِحْ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ ۗ وَمَن يُطِعِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيمًا

"O you who have believed, fear Allah and speak words of appropriate justice. He will [then] amend for you your deeds and forgive you your sins. And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has certainly attained a great attainment." [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 70-71]

To proceed:

The most truthful speech is the Book of Allah, and the best guidance is the guidance of Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. And the worst of matters are their innovations, and every innovation is a heresy (*bid‘ah*), and every heresy is a misguidance, and every misguidance is in the Fire.

Honored brothers, here we are with the twenty-fifth day of the month of Dhūl-Qa'dah for the year 1432 of the blessed Prophetic Hijrah. And we are also with the **Fourth Lesson** of a Sharia course titled: *Masā'il fī al-Īmān* (Issues Regarding Faith).

Today, *in shā' Allāh*, we will speak about the **Khawārij** and the **Mu'tazilah**, and we will speak about the ruling on the perpetrator of a major sin (*murtakib al-kabīrah*).

Before I speak and delve into the subject, I would like to review the titles with you, so you know what remains and what you have taken from this course. So we give a simple summary so you are clear about the subject of the lesson.

Regarding the **First Lesson** which we started on the 4th of Dhūl-Qa'dah 1432, we spoke in it about the categories of people in the era of the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*.

In the **Second Lesson**, we spoke about the difference in the appellation of Faith, and read the Hadith of Jibrīl, and reviewed with you some definitions from the book *Al-Sharī'ah* by Imam Al-Ājurrī, and reviewed the most important sects of the *Murji'ah*.

The **Third Lesson** last week, we spoke about the doubt of whoever said that Faith in the Arabic language is Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*) only. We differentiated between the *Jahmiyyah* and *Karrāmiyyah* and said they are two contradictory sects in the issue of defining Faith. We defined Faith according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and read a text by Imam Abū 'Ubayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām. We also read from the book of Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū 'Abdillāh ibn Baṭṭah, and read from the book of Qāḍī Abū Ya'lā al-Farrā'. And we also read a text from the book *Al-Tamhīd* by Al-Ḥāfiẓ ibn 'Abd al-Barr. Then we proceeded after that to read the text of Imam Al-Bāqillānī, a great Imam of the Ash'ari Imams, and his defining of Faith as in the Arabic language, restricting the definition of Faith [to affirmation], and we refuted this doubt.

Then the lesson **Today** will be, *in shā' Allāh*, about the *Khawārij* and *Mu'tazilah* and the ruling on the perpetrator of a major sin.

The subject will be as follows:

We will speak about the text of a question that came to Imam Abū Thawr, with which we open. There is a debate between *Ahl al-Sunnah* and the *Murji'ah* regarding the definition of Faith. We might read a text from the book *Ṣarīḥ al-Sunnah* by Imam Al-Ṭabarī. We will point briefly to the refutation of Imam Ibn Taymiyyah against Al-Bāqillānī regarding his citation of the verse: (*And you would not be a believer in us even if we were truthful*) [QS. Yūsuf: 17], that Faith here means Affirmation. He said: It is

said that so-and-so believes in the punishment of the grave, and so-and-so does not believe in the punishment of the grave, and so-and-so believes in intercession and so-and-so does not believe in intercession. Al-Bāqillānī intends by that that the word "believes" here means affirms. We will refute this doubt quickly.

After that, we might speak about the origin of the doubt of the innovators; their belief that Faith is a whole that cannot be partitioned, and that Faith and some Disbelief cannot coexist in a human. We will also speak about the perpetrators of a major sin and the opinion of the *Khawārij* and *Mu‘tazilah*. Who are the *Khawārij* and a brief about them, and who are the *Mu‘tazilah* and a brief about them. This is the fourth lesson today. Naturally, this is according to time; meaning if time overtakes us, we will be compelled to postpone some issues to the coming episode, but I give you that from a theoretical perspective.

The **Fifth Lesson**, *in shā’ Allāh*, will be about the **Ash‘āriyyah** and **Māturīdiyyah**, and this is a very important lesson for an active movement existing in the Islamic world. So we will speak about the *Ash‘āriyyah* and *Māturīdiyyah*, and speak a brief about the first founder in each sect, and the difference between the *Māturīdiyyah* and *Ash‘āriyyah*.

And we speak a brief about the Ḥanafīs specifically, about Imam Abū Ḥanīfah and some related matters in the issue; because the *Ash‘āriyyah* and *Māturīdiyyah* and these groups, most of them, especially the *Māturīdiyyah*, are Ḥanafīs. Meaning you hardly find a Mālikī or Shāfi‘ī Māturīdī, most of them are Ḥanafīs. So we will speak about this issue, especially what is called the "**Murji'ah of the Jurists**" (*Murji'at al-Fuqahā’*), considering that Imam Abū Ḥanīfah is among those described as being from the *Murji'ah* of the Jurists.

And the **Sixth Lesson**, *in shā’ Allāh*, after that we will speak in it about an outcome from the outcomes of the dispute, which is: Does Faith increase and decrease? And we speak about Exception (*Istithnā’*) in Faith according to the sects. Meaning is it permissible if someone asks me: "Are you a believer?" that I say to him: "I am a believer *in shā’ Allāh*"? We will review this issue and speak about the levels of religion in this subject.

The **Seventh Lesson** of this course, *in shā’ Allāh*, we will speak in it about the **Nullifiers of Faith** (*Nawāqiḍ al-Īmān*) and models of these nullifiers, and refuting some doubts and issues specific to the ruling of **Abandoning the Genus of Action**. Whoever abandons the genus of action; the genus of prayer, abandoning it entirely. And the differences between scholars in these issues, because these issues are not issues of luxury or ancient history, but they are realistic issues. There are those who adopt

these ideas and argue by saying: ("Whoever says *Lā ilāha illā Allāh* enters Paradise") for example, and some Hadiths like the Hadith of the Card and others. All this we will refute regarding the doubts.

The **Eighth Lesson**, which is stating the **Madhhab of the Salaf in General**. In the end, after we reviewed all these sects, we will say the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in general regarding the subject of Faith. It will be closest to a general review, but we will review what you must believe here and what the righteous *Salaf* were upon.

We begin by reading a text mentioned by Imam Al-Lālakā'ī, who died in the year 408 AH. He has a book named *I'tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*. This book is of several parts, about nine parts approximately depending on the type of printing and the editor. This book is comprehensive of all famous issues; issues of Names and Attributes, issues in refuting the *Qadariyyah*, and he dedicated a part, mostly the fourth or fifth, to issues of Faith. He reviews as follows: He brings Qur'anic verses, then brings Hadiths, then after that brings the Successors (*Tābi'ūn*) and the Successors of the Successors (*Tābi'ū al-Tābi'īn*) like this up to his time. Thus was Imam Al-Ājurrī as we saw, reviewing verses in his book *Al-Sharī'ah*, then reviewing Hadiths.

Therefore, you find reassurance while reading the books of the *Salaf* while they argue against other sects. Other sects, you find no Sharia evidences with them. Most evidences are either from language, or analogy, or corrupt interpretations. They dizzy you in analogies and things, and in the end, you do not exit except distracted. As for the books of the *Salaf*, they say "This is the saying of Allah" and "This is the saying of the Messenger," and these are the Hadiths, and these are the Successors, then they discuss with them in language. We saw the refutations of the scholars, and saw Imam Abū 'Ubayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām, that he refuted them and debunked them severely; the sects of the *Murji'ah* and the sects that relied on Faith only by its definition in Arabic language.

Therefore, Imam Ibn Taymiyyah, when Al-Bāqillānī argued with (*But you would not be a believer in us, even if we were truthful*) [QS. Yūsuf: 17], and said: This faith means affirmation. He said: No, this is not conceded. Because the word Faith in the language might mean Affirmation, meaning Acknowledgment, meaning Reassurance. But here the word Faith always comes regarding the Unseen (*Ghayb*). Unseen things, we say about them Faith (*Īmān*), and we do not say about them Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*) [linguistically in this specific context]. A direct report I say to you "believed/affirmed" (*muṣaddaq*) or "truthful" (*ṣādiq*). Therefore (*But you would not be a believer in us*): The brothers of Yūsuf when they came to

their father, did they come to inform him about what? About a news he saw and they saw? Or informing him about an unseen thing? They inform him about an unseen thing; when they tell him about the story of their brother and the fabrication they brought, and with false blood. So it speaks about Unseen.

Therefore, Ibn Taymiyyah says: Faith in this case is specific here. It is not said always, except if it was about an unseen thing. We say: We believe in the punishment of the grave. And he says the evidence relied upon by Al-Bāqillānī is evidence against him essentially. He does not find evidences, the utmost thing Al-Bāqillānī has is this. He said: And Faith, we say this so-and-so believes in intercession, and this person believes in the punishment of the grave for example, or does not believe. So it means affirms. He said: No; these terminologies appeared due to the existence of this innovation that denied intercession. The existence of the innovation that denied the punishment of the grave. You are the ones who innovated it; this innovation was shown by the *Mu'tazilah* and others. So this speech is incorrect.

Because when he says: "I believe in intercession," it does not mean believe meaning affirmation/knowledge only. It means believes in intercession, meaning he believes in reality that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* will intercede for the people of major sins and sins. There is intercession according to levels, and believers intercede, and angels intercede; we believe in this. And the *Mu'tazilah* do not believe fundamentally in the subject of intercession because they declare the people of major sins disbelievers, so how will he intercede for him?! Therefore they deny these Hadiths.

So he refutes saying no, there is no one who says: "I believe in the punishment of the grave," and it is not conceived that there is punishment. Meaning "I affirm the punishment of the grave," he believes in the punishment of the grave that if a human dies, he will be punished in the *Barzakh*, in this stage between the world and the Hereafter.

So it means that what Al-Bāqillānī used as evidence is speech not conceded to him. Because there is no Faith called Affirmation only and Heart Knowledge only. Nor is it conceived that Faith means I believe if I die I will be punished. "I believe in intercession for the people of major sins"; these people do not believe in intercession fundamentally.

Naturally, when we address later, *in shā' Allāh*, the statement of the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in issues of Faith, we will review for you the origin of the doubt and where it came from. It is the doubt of those who expelled action from Faith, and caused the difference regarding the perpetrator of a

major sin. We told you the doubt is that they believe that Faith is a **Whole that cannot be partitioned**. What is the meaning of a whole that cannot be partitioned? They gave examples for that, they said Faith means Affirmation, Heart Knowledge or Affirmation only or so on. Or speech by the tongue only and action does not matter.

Therefore the *Khawārij*, when we speak, they and the *Mu'tazilah* considered it a whole that cannot be partitioned. Therefore they said: Like the number ten. If you deleted one from it, it is no longer the number ten. So Faith is like this, if you removed a part from it, meaning if one committed a major sin or committed any sin, here it means Faith is finished. This is their perspective. Ibn Taymiyyah refuted them: The number ten, if you removed one from it, it becomes number nine. So faith is still present.

And they had a solution of honey and vinegar, they struck this example with the solution. This solution, if you took a compound from it, it is no longer the solution. He said: If we took the vinegar, the honey remains, and if we took the honey, the vinegar remains. Meaning he refuted them with their own words. He said I will not concede these matters to you, because there are compound things, if we separated them they go away actually in this case, like the soul and the body. But there are things not necessarily going away. And these examples which you struck... and the proof for that is the term "Worship" (*'Ibādah*). They said any term that you treat like this, either you take it all or not; if it decreases, the definition ends.

He said the term "Worship" applies to prayer, fasting, zakat, and hajj, and applies to very many things. So if we removed a part of it, did the word "Worship" decrease? And he struck many examples. *In shā' Allāh,* I will recount them to you in the statements of the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in detail, especially in these issues.

So they struck many examples, most of them rational, and examples from reality. But they gave them other very many examples. He said even the Qur'an, when it was in Mecca, Surahs were revealed like Sūrah Al-Kahf and Meccan Surahs, so was it called Qur'an or what was it called? Meaning the number of Surahs revealed in the Meccan era; meaning the Qur'an was not complete. So will we call it Qur'an or what will we call it? Because by their logic, it is not called Qur'an. But it was not completed except with the verse: (*This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favor upon you and have approved for you Islam as religion*) [QS. Al-Mā'idah: 3]; it was not completed except with Sūrah Al-Naṣr (*When the victory of Allah has come and the conquest*) [QS. An-Naṣr: 1].

So this is a very dangerous matter and a silencing refutation from Shaykhul-Islām. He said to them: This Qur'an, if you say that the Whole, if

any part decreases from it, is not known/defined; the Qur'an in the Meccan era was not complete, yet Allah says (*Indeed, We sent it down*), (*A revelation from a Wise, Praiseworthy One*). These Surahs like Sūrah Yūsuf and others were revealed and speak about the Complete Qur'an. Notice these introductions in the Surahs did not speak about a part of the Qur'an, rather they speak about the Qur'an completely, while the Qur'an in this period was not complete. So this is a refutation of them even from the perspective of linguistic and rational citation on which they relied.

Before we enter the subject of the *Khawārij*, I read to you the text of **Imam Abū Thawr** *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi*. Imam Abū Thawr is a great Imam of the Imams of Muslims. So that you know how they used to refute; not as people imagine, meaning he says to him "It is like this even if you do not like it, this is the verse even if you do not like it." No, rather they used to discuss with them, and perhaps use reason with them, and give them premises for what they understand.

Meaning not as you come to ask a Sheikh, he says to you "It is like this and finished." "O brother, I have a doubt, I am sick, treat me." Even if he has a dangerous doubt, he says to him: "It is like this, go learn your religion." "I basically came to you so you teach me! Meaning if you do not teach me my religion who will teach me?!" So this is the problem, that they do not have patience to bear a doubt. A youth comes to a Sheikh in the mosque or to a teacher or other, and raises a doubt and wants to learn. So teach him, O brother.

I will read the text to you so you know how these scholars used to converse with others. These were people of knowledge and theorizations. Imam Abū Thawr, his name was Ibrāhīm ibn Khālid ibn Abī al-Yamān. Born in Baghdad, was from the scholars of Baghdad. Died in the year 240 AH. Meaning a year before Imam Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal. The Imam died in the year 241 AH, and he is from Baghdad too.

Question from a student:

Does his lineage meet with the Companion Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān?

The Sheikh:

Allah knows best, this attribution is not proven. What is almost certain is that Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī is attributed to Imam Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī, the noble Companion. As for this one, it is said to Ibn Abī al-Yamān, or attributed to Yemen meaning. But Allah knows best.

Regarding the period in which Imam Abū Thawr lived, it was a period where argumentation appeared. Because it was in the period of the

beginning of argumentation through the start of the *Khawārij* then *Mu'tazilah*, and these appeared in this period and raised some doubts. The issues were all purely scientific theorizations. The State was Islamic, very strong, there was Caliphate, there was Jihad, there were horses pounding the places of frontier-guarding (*Ribāṭ*) at the disbelievers and raiding them. Therefore scholars were speaking on this issue. Do you marvel how they were speaking on these issues? Because the State was stable. This might be a type of luxury for some. When some Caliphs introduced translation, especially in the days of Al-Ma'mūn; these bad translations that harmed. I told you Caliph Al-Ma'mūn was accused of being a Zaydi Shiite, and the *Mu'tazilah* influenced him greatly. Here such movements of *Irjā'* appeared from the old movements as well. Naturally regarding *I'tizāl* (Mu'tazilism), it appeared in the days of the Umayyad State, in the days of Caliph 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān and his son Hishām ibn 'Abd al-Malik, such things appeared. We will speak about them regarding the *Mu'tazilah*.

So this treatise, as Imam Al-Lālakā'ī says, mentioning it in his book: That a question came to Imam Abū Thawr, he cited with his chain saying: "A man from the people of Khorasan asked Abū Thawr about Faith: What is it? Does it increase and decrease? Is it speech, or speech and action, and affirmation and action?" Meaning he says to him: Tell me exactly what it is.

He said: "So he answered him saying: You asked, may Allah have mercy on you and pardon you, about Faith, what is it? And does it increase and decrease? And is it speech, or speech and action, and affirmation and action? I inform you about the saying of the sects: Know, may Allah have mercy on us and you, that Faith is Affirmation (*taṣdīq*) by the heart, Speech by the tongue, and Action by the limbs. That is because there is no disagreement among the people of knowledge regarding a man who, if he said: 'I testify that Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* is One, and that what the Messengers brought is truth,' and acknowledged all legislations; then said: 'My heart did not knot upon anything of this, nor do I affirm it,' that he is not a Muslim."

Meaning, he who says that and acknowledges and testifies, and says at the same time: "My heart did not resolve upon anything of this nor do I affirm it," he is not a Muslim.

He says: "And if he said: 'The Messiah is Allah,' and denied the command of Islam, and said: 'My heart did not knot upon anything of that [denial],' he is a disbeliever by manifesting that, and not a believer. So when he was not a believer by Acknowledgment if Affirmation was not with it, nor a believer by Affirmation if Acknowledgment was not with it, until he

is affirming with his heart and acknowledging with his tongue." Meaning both together are necessary. Meaning the pillars we told you about. Imam Al-Ājurrī said you must acknowledge by tongue, by heart, and by action; three pillars. You cannot cut one of them. And Imam Abū Thawr is naturally before Al-Ājurrī, meaning Al-Ājurrī took it from him as well.

He says: "So if there was affirmation by the heart and acknowledgment by the tongue, he was a believer according to him [the objector/Murji'i]. And according to some of them, he is not [a believer] until there is Action with Affirmation. So he becomes a believer by these things if they are combined. So when they negated that Faith is one thing, and said it is by two things in the saying of some of them, and three things in the saying of others; he was not a believer except by what they agreed upon of these three. And that is because if he brings the three things, all of them testify that he is a believer. So we said [he is a believer] by what they agreed upon: Affirmation by the heart, Acknowledgment by the tongue, and Action by the limbs."

He says: "As for the sect that claimed that Action is not from Faith, it is said to them: What did Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* want from the servants when He said to them: 'And establish prayer and give zakat'? Did He request from them Acknowledgment, or Acknowledgment and Action?"

Meaning by His saying (*And establish prayer and give zakat*), does He want acknowledgment and action, or acknowledgment only? Meaning he says "I believe in this verse (*And establish prayer and give zakat*)." We say to him: And did Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* want from you to acknowledge and affirm prayer and zakat only? Or did He want from you Acknowledgment and Action? To pray and act and give zakat? Does He want the two from you or want one only?

He says: "If it [the sect] said: 'Allah wanted Acknowledgment and did not want Action,' then it has disbelieved." Because Allah says (*And establish prayer and give zakat*), meaning He commands you with action, obligates prayer upon you. So how do you say He wanted Acknowledgment only?! He says if they said this is Acknowledgment only, then it disbelieved.

He says: "And if it said: 'He wanted from them Acknowledgment and Action,' it is said to them: If He wanted both matters together, why did you claim that he is a believer by one of them without the other?" If you believe He wanted Acknowledgment and Action, why do you say he is a believer by one only? They say he is a believer only by Acknowledgment. Meaning he says: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh*

Muḥammad Rasūlullāh), according to the opinion of most sects of *Murji'ah* and others. Or by Affirmation in the heart, he acknowledges with his heart. But if he does not act, if he dies upon this, he enters Paradise. Why did the separation happen here if you say he believes by the two together?

He says: "If He wanted both matters together from them, why did you claim that he is a believer by one of them without the other, while He wanted them both together?" Allah wanted them both together, meaning (*And establish prayer and give zakat*), and you say "Yes, this is a Qur'anic verse we believe in," and the verse contains action.

He says: "What do you think if a man said: 'I do everything Allah commanded but I do not acknowledge it,' is he a believer? If they said: 'No,' it is said to them: 'Then if he said: I acknowledge everything Allah commanded but I do not do it, is he a believer?'"

Meaning notice, he said: "I do everything Allah commanded but I do not acknowledge it." Meaning he will pray and fast but does not acknowledge it in his heart, meaning does not believe it, nor in his tongue, he prays only. Is this person a believer? Naturally no; because both are necessary together. How do you pray mechanically like this while you do not believe that this is from Allah? Meaning rationally impossible.

So if he said: "I acknowledge everything Allah commanded but I do not do it." He brought it to them from the reverse. The problem with them is Action. He is trying to corner them in the issue of Action. He says: "If they said 'Yes,' it is said: What is the difference? You claimed that Allah wanted both matters together. So if it was permissible for one to be a believer if he abandoned the other, it is permissible to be [a believer] by the other if he acted upon it and did not acknowledge." Meaning if you differentiated and affirmed that he is a believer if he acknowledged only, then why did you differentiate in the subject of Action? And we can say to you Acknowledgment only is not sufficient if there is no Action. You delete Action from the root of Faith. So this is the problem with you. Therefore, look at the method of dialogue and the method of debating them in this good way.

The Khawārij:

We will enter now into the subject of the **Khawārij** and the **Mu'tazilah**, and give you some things about these sects. Naturally, the *Khawārij*, we will not speak about them with all details of the *Khawārij*. The issues are very difficult and contain many details. We choose only a specific issue, which is the subject regarding the issue of disagreement on the **Perpetrator of a Major Sin** (*Murtakib al-Kabīrah*).

Because we told you that the *Khawārij* and *Mu‘tazilah* agree with *Ahl al-Sunnah* and the Righteous *Salaf* in including Action in the appellation of Faith. Meaning they have no disagreement in this naming. But the problem with them is that regarding the issue of the perpetrator of a major sin. But we must give a brief about the *Khawārij*.

Regarding the *Khawārij*, Imam Al-Shahrastānī mentioned them, died in 548 AH. And ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī mentioned them in *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*. These issues are almost similar among them. And the book *Al-Tabṣīr fī Ma‘ālim al-Dīn* and others. All these mentioned the origin of the *Khawārij* appeared in the year 37 AH, in the Battle of Ṣiffīn. The problem occurred in the Battle of Ṣiffīn between the army of our master ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and the army of our master Mu‘āwiyah *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhum jamī‘an*.

So the *Fitnah* happened and the Arbitration (*Taḥkīm*) happened. The cause of the problem here was the appearance of the *Khawārij*. However, they appeared in the days of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* but had no impact. One came in the days of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* and said to the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* at the division of spoils: "Be just, O Messenger of Allah." The Messenger's anger intensified, and he said: "Who will be just if I am not just?" Then our master ‘Umar said: "Shall I kill him for he is a hypocrite?" The man was leaving, so the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: "From the loins of this one will emerge a people who will pass through Islam as the arrow passes through the game/target." Then the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* described the characteristics of the *Khawārij* in this Hadith. It is considered a miraculous Hadith because the Messenger described for them the characteristics of the *Khawārij* which they saw and which appeared throughout history with the characteristics as the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* alerted us.

So the *Khawārij* in the general definition: **Everyone who revolted against the rightful Imam upon whom the Community (*Jamā‘ah*) agreed**, is called a Khārijī (Kharijite). Whether the revolt was in the days of the Companions against the Rightly Guided Imams, or was after them in the days of the Successors and Successors of Successors, and the Imams in every time and place. He who revolts against the rightful Imam. This description is a general definition. But their beginning, they had names. They are more than twenty sects, and every sect is divided against itself. They used to split like the atom. People of innovation are like this.

But the first group were titled the **Muḥakkimah**, then the **Azāriqah**, then the **Najdāt**, and the **Ḥarūriyyah**. These were famous

among them. But there are more than twenty sects. This group agrees entirely on specific things. Meaning most of them gather upon them. Naturally there are differences between them, they declared each other disbelievers. Sects declared disbelievers, and this one exits and repents from repentance... strange and laughable things even in history.

These agreed entirely on declaring the people of the Camel (*Jamal*) and Ṣiffīn disbelievers. And declaring Lady ʻĀ'ishah disbeliever, and declaring Al-Zubayr disbeliever, and declaring Ṭalḥah ibn ʻUbaydillāh disbeliever, and declaring our master ʻAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib disbeliever. ʻUthmān ibn ʻAffān disbelieved [according to them] after the other six years [of his caliphate]; because they were loyal to him in the first [six], then the other six years they considered him to have disbelieved, *wal-ʻiyādhu billāh*. And naturally they consider the abodes of their opponents to be abodes of disbelief (*Dār Kufr*) and Shirk. And they also do not validate the marriages of others among the Muslims; they considered that you are marrying a disbelieving woman. And they declare the perpetrators of major sins disbelievers. And they have a secondary subject for them, that they revolt against the Imams, but this was according to capability.

And most of them did not use *Taqiyyah* (dissimulation). Meaning most of them in the beginning did not use *Taqiyyah*, rather they forbid it, like the Azāriqah and others. Meaning they are the opposite of the Shiites, because they manifest and do not conceal. And they challenge. And they have bravery and heroism, like Qaṭarī ibn al-Fujā'ah and others who appeared in history, and Shabīb. Heroes, but they were in misguidance.

These appeared in the days of the Commander of the Faithful ʻAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib *raḍiyallāhu ʻanhu* and were in the war of Ṣiffīn. Among them was one named Misʻar ibn Fudayk, and Zayd ibn Ḥuṣayn al-Ṭā'ī.

This group [the *Khawārij*], when they saw that the Companions wanted to reconcile, and some people intervened for what is called the **Arbitration** (*Taḥkīm*)... For they were the ones who, when the army of Shām raised the *Maṣāḥif* (Qur'ans) and said: "No judgment except by the Qur'an," they said to him: "How can you fight those who want to judge by the Qur'an?" Our master ʻAlī said to them, as in the biographies: "It is a deception, they are deceiving you." But he descended upon their desire, and they said: "Let us send an arbitrator." So they chose Abū Mūsā al-Ashʻarī *raḍiyallāhu ʻanhu* afterwards.

Then after they agreed to the Arbitration, meaning they originally pushed him towards Arbitration, he agreed to the Arbitration, and what happened happened. The subject of Arbitration failed naturally due to these *Fitnahs*, then what happened happened. They said to him immediately after

that: "You appointed men as judges and did not appoint the Book of Allah as judge," then they opposed him. Meaning they were the ones who pressured him, then after that when he agreed to the Arbitration, and then the Arbitration did not come according to their whims, suddenly they say: "You opposed the Qur'an and appointed men as judges regarding the Qur'an!" And a debate occurred between them. So this is the beginning.

But the major sects among them are: **The First Muḥakkimah**, who were rejecting the Arbitration and said: "You appointed these men as judges." And **The Azāriqah**, **The Najdāt**, **The Bayhasiyyah**, **The ‘Ajāridah**, **The Tha‘ālibah**, and **The Ibāḍiyyah**. Naturally, the **Ibāḍiyyah** are contemporary until now, they have a state in Oman, and in Algeria, and in Libya. Jabal Nafusa in Libya was originally a headquarters for the Ibāḍiyyah. And the Ibāḍiyyah had a state that was in Tahert in Algeria, until today the Ibāḍiyyah exist in Algeria. Their rule lasted about one hundred and forty years approximately. Then came Abū ‘Ubaydillāh the Shiite, the Rāfiḍī; this one who killed them and violated their sovereignty, destroyed them and dispersed them greatly. Then the ‘Ubaydī State appeared later, which is called the Fatimid State. Meaning Abū ‘Ubaydillāh the Shiite is the one who eliminated the Ibāḍī State.

The First Muḥakkimah are those who revolted against the Commander of the Faithful ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, when the affair of the arbitrators appeared. They gathered at Ḥarūrā’, therefore they call them **The Ḥarūriyyah**, a place near Kufa where they gathered. Their head was a person named ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Kawwā’, and ‘Attāb ibn al-A‘war, and ‘Abdullāh ibn Wahb al-Rāsibī. These are the major *Khawārij*. And ‘Urwah ibn Jarīr, and Yazīd ibn Abī ‘Āṣim al-Muḥāribī, and Ḥurqūṣ ibn Zuhayr. These are the ones who declared hostility against the Commander of the Faithful *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* and they are the ones who objected to him in the mosque while he was giving a sermon, and said: "No hearing [obedience] for you." Meaning he was patient with them, and they tired our master ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.

Therefore, they did not win because of this. Meaning the army of Shām was organized and such *Fitnahs* did not exist in it. As for the army of our master ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, and he is who he is in rank, there was a group of troublemakers causing trouble for him in everything. Whenever he says a word, they pressure him. Whenever he sees something, he is compelled to concede for their sake. So they tired him, until in the end they rejected him and declared him a disbeliever. And they were worshippers; meaning they were not people of libertinism and obscenity. The Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* describes them saying: "One of you will belittle his prayer compared to their prayer." Meaning he prays and

worships, and their faces are yellow from excessive fasting, and their knees are like the calluses of a camel from excessive worship.

Therefore, the one who harmed Islam greatly is from these worshippers and ascetics who claimed asceticism. Like Ibn Tūmart in the lands of Maghreb. When Ibn Tūmart appeared and destroyed the State of the **Murābiṭīn** (Almoravids), due to the silence of the Murābiṭīn about him because he seemed ascetic and pious. Then it appeared that he was a malicious man calling himself the Mahdī, and calling to *Ahl al-Bayt* claiming he loves them and forbids evil and so on. It turned out he was a corrupter, and killed scholars, and he was the one who caused the removal of the Murābiṭīn State, and an innovated state was established named the **Muwaḥḥidīn** (Almohads) State later.

So I mean that these worshippers used to deceive people. Therefore, the *Khawārij* deceived masses in the region of Iraq and Iran, and all these regions were the main place for these *Khawārij*. Then they spread after that in some countries like Yemen, then went to the Islamic Maghreb, then in Tunisia, then in Algeria, and settled there in Algeria specifically and Tunisia.

And these *Khawārij* also, our master ʻAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib debated them on some things. Among the *Khawārij* are those called **The Extremists** (*Ghulāt*); the *Khawārij* themselves declared them disbelievers, and *Ahl al-Sunnah* naturally declared them disbelievers. Because they said... they did not acknowledge Sūrah Yūsuf and named it a bad name and said it is not from the Qur'an. And there are those among them who denied very dangerous things, and we do not like to mention them, because they are extinct sects.

And there are some of them who spoke about the Names of Allah *Subḥānahu wa Taʻālā* and were influenced by some **Jabriyyah** (Determinists) and others, that everything is compelled, and that the servant has no actions. Like the *Jahmiyyah* too, they said Allah does everything and the servant does not do anything, there is no action for the servant at all. Meaning the opposite of the *Qadariyyah*; for the *Qadariyyah* negated the action from Allah and attributed it to the servant, that the servant does anything and so on. "You do something Allah did not decree and you are the one who did it just now." Therefore they said: "The Decree is *unuf* (new)"; meaning this subject is initiated anew, meaning something new I do now but Allah did not decree it.

And we do not say this. Allah *Subḥānahu wa Taʻālā* created good, and created evil, and created actions, and creates them for us if we intend them. Meaning I want to carry this book, Allah creates the action for me

now, He creates it for me because I intended it. We suffice with this so you are not distracted in these issues.

So these *Khawārij*, when they appeared, our master ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib debated them. They said: "You appointed men as judges over us." Then ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib replied to them later and said: "If I appointed men as judges, the Qur'an itself contains Arbitration (*Taḥkīm*), and it was not in the Imamate or the Major Caliphate or in wars between Muslims, rather it was regarding husband and wife: 'Send an arbitrator from his family and an arbitrator from her family. If they both desire reconciliation, Allah will cause it between them.' [QS. An-Nisā’: 35] How do you say you appointed judges?! The Qur'an is the one that appointed men as judges."

And they said to him: "You erased your name in the peace treaty with Mu‘āwiyah and wrote: ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, and did not write Commander of the Faithful." He said: "I was present at al-Ḥudaybiyah with the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, and Suhayl ibn ‘Amr insisted on that and said: 'If we knew you were the Messenger of Allah we would have accepted Islam/submitted, so write your name and your father's name only.' And the Messenger of Allah agreed and wrote it like that: Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdillāh." So he said the Messenger did that.

And the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* appointed Sa‘d ibn Mu‘ādh as judge over Banū Qurayẓah regarding their blood and wealth, when they said: "We submit to the judgment of Sa‘d," because he was a friend to them and an ally to them. So when the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* besieged them, they said: "We submit to the judgment of Sa‘d ibn Mu‘ādh." So he appointed the man as judge over them. So they say: "You appoint men as judges," and here is Arbitration existing. Even in hunting in the Ḥaram (Sanctuary):

يَحْكُمُ بِهِ ذَوَا عَدْلٍ مِّنكُمْ

"Two just men among you shall judge it." [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 95]

So the subject of men judging exists.

So these are dangerous doubts with which they destroyed people. They say: "And no judgment except by the Qur'an." Will the Qur'an walk like this alone?! There are men who judge, and the Qur'an commands men to judge:

وَأَنِ احْكُم بَيْنَهُم بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ

"And judge, [O Muḥammad], between them by what Allah has revealed." [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 49]

Does not the man judge to rule?! They say you appointed men as judges! Look at their intellects. And they influenced the common rabble and formed a very large army.

And he said: "What else do you resent from me?" They said: "We resent from you that when you fought them in the Battle of the Camel, in which was Lady ʻĀ'ishah and our master Ṭalḥah ibn ʻUbaydillāh and Al-Zubayr *raḍiyallāhu ʻanhum* when he defeated them in the Battle of the Camel, they said to him: Why did you not finish off their wounded, and permit their wealth, and you did not permit their women?" So he said to them: "We did not declare them disbelievers originally so that we permit their blood and permit their women and finish off the wounded." So they said to him: "Then why did you make the wealth lawful?" He said: "Because they took the wealth when they came to Kufa, they took our wealth so we took it from them as they took, and we fought them as they fought us." Meaning the issue is as if it is fighting between Muslims with each other, and I did not fight them the fighting of disbelievers.

They said: "Then how do you differentiate between wealth and women, and in the ruling of spoils, women also become captives, and you did not distribute them?" He said: "If the matter was so, then in whose share would the Mother of the Believers ʻĀ'ishah be?!" So they were silenced. No one could speak. Because if one of them said that ʻĀ'ishah *raḍiyallāhu ʻanhā* the Mother of the Believers becomes a captive, he disbelieves immediately.

Who dares while Allah *Subḥānahu wa Taʻālā* says:

النَّبِيُّ أَوْلَىٰ بِالْمُؤْمِنِينَ مِنْ أَنفُسِهِمْ ۖ وَأَزْوَاجُهُ أُمَّهَاتُهُمْ

"The Prophet is more worthy of the believers than themselves, and his wives are their mothers." [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 6]

Meaning she is your mother. Will you marry your mother?! Your mother means forbidden for the Ummah since this Qur'anic text was revealed until the Hour is established, until [Allah] inherits the earth and whoever is on it. Assuming she lived, this is an eternal prohibition. Because she is your mother by the ruling of the Sharia, other than the prohibition by the ruling of birth. This is prohibition by the Sharia. And this is honoring the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ʻalayhi wa sallam*.

So he took about four thousand of them, asked them to repent, and they said "We repent to Allah," so he accepted their repentance. As for Ḥurqūṣ ibn Zuhayr and this group, they appointed Ibn al-Kawwā' as an Amir over them and named him Commander of the Faithful. Then he

fought them in the region of **Nahrawān** in Iraq, and defeated them a defeat by which he dispersed them and destroyed them completely. Our master ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib was able to establish for us the **Fiqh of the Rebels** (*Bughāh*) and the **Rulings of the Apostate** (*Murtadd*). All these are taken from the Fiqh of our master ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, because he dealt with them practically.

So they obstructed him. Look at the Islamic conquests in the history of Islam, you find conquests in the days of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* conquests in the days of ‘Umar, conquests in the days of ‘Uthmān. As for ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, you do not find that for him. Even Imam Al-Kalā‘ī al-Ḥimyarī, when he came to the states of Islam, deleted the state of our master ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib from the conquests. He said there are no conquests, rather he *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* was busy with these people of *Fitnah*, for he was fighting the *Khawārij*. Meaning the five years which our master ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib ruled, they tired him and exhausted him until he was killed as a martyr, *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu*.

So this is a general brief about the *Khawārij*. The *Khawārij* have sects existing until our time. And they perished naturally throughout history; they used to appear and disappear. The State fights them and they fight, because they did not use *Taqiyyah*, they used to emerge like that. The army goes to fight them and they fight it. Sometimes they seize kingdoms and nations, then after that the Caliphate State eliminates them.

But they founded states as in the **Ibāḍiyyah**, followers of ‘Abdullāh ibn Ibāḍ. This one appeared in the days of Hishām [ibn] ‘Abd al-Malik and made a state. And some of them fled to the Maghreb and to Libya, then after that they founded a state called the **Rustamid** (*Rustamiyyah*), State of Banū Rustam, which ruled about one hundred and forty years. And it had the same principles as the *Khawārij*. They say it is the least extreme sect, but it is from the *Khawārij*. Even the Ibāḍiyyah existing now, naturally deterioration happened to it in many things and mixing, but it has the same old principles at least. But they do not declare openly like the old *Khawārij*. Meaning they say about Muslims now that they are Muslims, and they say regarding the ruling of the perpetrator of a major sin that they are **People of Monotheism** (*Ahl Tawḥīd*). Therefore, they permit marriage (*Nikāḥ*) from them. The Ibāḍiyyah do this. But the one who dies from these "Monotheists," they said he is not a believer but a disbeliever eternal in the Fire!

Meaning he has the rulings of this world in this world. The same idea as the *Mu‘tazilah*, which is the Position between the Two Positions (*Al-Manzilah bayn al-Manzilatayn*). But the *Mu‘tazilah* used to call him

Fāsiq (immoral), meaning giving him the ruling of this world; so dealing with him is permissible, and marriage is permissible, and other things. The rulings of this world are all apparent upon him. But if he dies, he dies upon a major sin, so he is a disbeliever eternal in the Fire. So the Ibāḍiyyah believe that. Because some people deceive and say they do not say that. Here are their books and basic references saying that, and that they consider us People of Monotheism. Meaning the Muslim opposing them, they say: Their name is People of Monotheism. Why? Because they have the Testimony, they testify (*an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*), and they have things they believe in, they share together. But they are People of Monotheism, so dealing with them is permissible in everything. But if one of them dies, he is eternal in the Fire.

Meaning he gives you a worldly ruling only. As for the Hereafter, you are in the Fire and deprived of Paradise; meaning it is forbidden for you if you died and committed a major sin. And naturally, Mu'tazili thought entered them. Most sects have a "twinning" with Mu'tazilism in creed. The Zaydi Shiites, despite the generality of the text and Imam Zayd and so on, even the Imami Shiites; the creed of the *Mu'tazilah* is what dominated them, in issues of interpretation (*Ta'wīl*) and Names and Attributes and many creedal things. Most reliance in the chapter of creeds among the people of innovation is mostly taken from the *Mu'tazilah*.

They influenced them very greatly, due to much discussion and argumentation. The *Mu'tazilah* used to rely on this, so they influenced them. And the people of innovation, you find one once a Mu'tazili or a Khariji, or a Mu'tazili and a Ja'fari Imami, or a Mu'tazili and a Zaydi, an Ibāḍī Mu'tazili, and so on. So among the people of innovation, you find there is twinning and rapprochement between them.

Therefore, this Ibāḍiyyah which appeared in that period is existing now in the Sultanate of Oman, this is the official *Madhhab*.

A student:

Did the Ibāḍiyyah emerge from the *Khawārij*?

The Sheikh:

Yes, their origin is *Khawārij*. 'Abdullāh ibn Ibāḍ is among them. Even you find in the books of sects, everyone who spoke on this issue counted the Ibāḍiyyah among the sects of the *Khawārij*. The same principles of the *Khawārij*, but they are lighter in descriptions in some rulings.

Meaning when they say about us "People of Monotheism." But the Azāriqah for example do not say that. He basically declares the **Qa'adah**

(Sitters) disbelievers, who are his own followers, those who do not fight jihad; he says to them "Go forth in Jihad" and they did not go forth, he considers them disbelievers while they are his followers! And this is the dispute between him and Najdah ibn ‘Āmir when they said "We do not declare the Sitters disbelievers and we excuse them." This dispute happened between the *Najdāt* and the *Azāriqah*. And the Azāriqah were among the largest sects of the *Khawārij*.

These are the ones who went, along with the *Najdāt*, to our master ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Zubayr. Some historians say that our master ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Zubayr *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* when the Umayyads and ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān came out and the conflict that happened; they came and said to him: "We want to fight with you and strive with you," when he was seeking refuge in the House in Mecca. Some historians criticize ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Zubayr that he did not benefit from the capabilities of the *Khawārij*. They came to him strong and tough, and he said to them: "I have no need of you." Meaning because he was not Machiavellian opportunistic. For the first thing they tested him with, they said to him: "We want to fight with you but on a condition: What do you say about Abū Bakr and ‘Umar?" He praised them. And they are pleased with Abū Bakr and ‘Umar and have no disagreement on this issue. And ‘Uthmān in the first half. But they declare our master ‘Uthmān disbeliever after that. So he expressed pleasure with ‘Uthmān and expressed pleasure with ‘Alī, and rebuked them severely: "How can I disavow ‘Uthmān and disavow ‘Alī when these are people of guidance?" Meaning he said good words, so they fled from him. So he said to them: "I have no need of you, I do not want you."

Those who criticize him say: "He should have exploited and equivocated the question." They analyze in the manner of the bitter political reality now, the system of lies and deceit and so on. They want him to lie, and it would be a great *Fitnah* that ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Zubayr insults ‘Uthmān and insults ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and disavows them; meaning he is like the *Khawārij*!

I refuted this doubt more than ten years ago in *Al-Minhāj Magazine* in "'Abdullāh ibn al-Zubayr: The Slandered One." Unfortunately, some from *Ahl al-Sunnah* slander our master ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Zubayr and raise these doubts in some books. Even general history books unfortunately oppressed our master ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Zubayr *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu wa ‘an abīhi*.

We take some doubts of these Khawārij:

What are the evidences with which they tired us and tired the Islamic world? Meaning some people say: Did the *Khawārij* appear just

like that without knowledge? No, they have a trace of knowledge. For example, from the doubts of the *Khawārij*: That they interpret the issue of Faith that you take it entirely; if anything decreases from it, there is no Faith basically. This is the secret of the definition for them although they included action. These believed that and came with texts. Do they have evidences? Do the *Khawārij* have Sharia evidences by which they inferred the disbelief of these people? Yes, they have evidences, but the scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah* refuted these evidences in the past and present and are still refuting.

This doubt is still repeated by some, even the vagabonds (*mutasakki'īn*), the pedantic ones (*mutanaṭṭi'īn*), and the extremists who attribute themselves to the *Khawārij*. And these *Khawārij* did not perish in meaning. They perished in name. But as a movement, they appeared for example in Egypt in the seventies at the hands of Shukrī Muṣṭafā. Shukrī Muṣṭafā was an agricultural engineer studying in the Faculty of Agriculture. He was arrested in the period of the days of 'Abd al-Nāṣir (Nasser) and was influenced by the torture and horror that was in the prisons in that period when they arrested the Muslim Brotherhood, and 'Abd al-Nāṣir was practicing torture. So a dispute happened in this period between the prisoners. Some of them used to say: "This one torturing me is not a Muslim," and the other says to him: "No, he is a Muslim." They argued with each other regarding the ruling of 'Abd al-Nāṣir. They were discussing the ruling of 'Abd al-Nāṣir and not discussing in general. So some say he is a disbeliever, and some say he is a believer. And the other says: "This one tortures me, so is this evidence of faith or religion?"

So these issues began through the effect of torture. Thus, the cause of the emergence of the *Khawārij* and the thought of Shukrī Muṣṭafā was due to the suffering of torture. They said: "A believer does not do this. One mocks the Qur'an, one tortures me as a believer because I pray, and because I want the Sharia and want the religion, and tortures me for my religion." So this is the cause of the problem for them. But the issue grew and inflated with Shukrī Muṣṭafā, and he was a very influential, eloquent, and strong person. So he influenced his followers. He was studying in the Faculty of Agriculture at Al-Azhar University. He made many treatises in refutations. And naturally he kept graduating in Takfir until he declared the third century disbelievers!

And he did not acknowledge the term *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and has very dangerous things and brings evidences. I met some followers of his, and they were in the "**Green Battalion**" (*Al-Katībah Al-Khaḍrā'*). This Green Battalion was for liquidating opponents. Meaning he argues with you, if you do not confess, meaning he establishes the proof upon you in Da'wah,

if you do not believe, they liquidate you with switchblades, hit you or slaughter you. And they caused very many problems and stirred panic.

And the regime lured them in the days of Sadat until he gave them a piece of land. They said: "We want migration (*Hijrah*) away from these corrupt societies!" Because he had a treatise named *Al-Tawassumāt* (Intuitions/Predictions). He means by *Al-Tawassumāt* that he imagines something will happen. He was imagining that a conflict will happen; America strikes Russia and Russia strikes America, and with this nuclear war they annihilate each other, and the world returns once again to traditional weapons and horses. Because he believed in the Hadiths speaking about horses ("Goodness is tied to the forelocks of horses until the Day of Resurrection, reward and booty"). So he used to interpret such Hadiths.

He says they will fortify themselves in a certain place, then people will conflict and nuclear war rises and the world collapses. So the monotheist believers rise from the beginning; the beginning starts here as it started in the days of the Companions. This *Al-Tawassumāt* is a treatise he wrote expecting things will happen in the world. And there are things he said that might have happened, like conflict and the end of the Soviet Union, but not as he imagined. He was imagining a collapse happening, meaning nuclear weapons end and there remain only weapons of sword and spear and so on.

Then after that they were lured also, so they assaulted a man who was not even like the Ministers of Endowments (*Awqāf*) in our days. Meaning Sheikh Dr. Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Dhahabī. He was a simple man, Minister of Endowments. There was no one like ‘Alī Jum‘ah and these grave-worshippers and some who defend the regimes and fight revolt against them. Meaning he was not even like Ṭanṭāwī. Rather they were simple, meaning a Minister of Endowments you don't even feel.

So they kidnapped him from his house and put him in an apartment then killed the man, *raḥimahullāh*. Meaning even provocation, and the common people did not bear it. How do you come to a simple Azhari Sheikh and kill him? They kidnapped him from his house and made a scene for him like that and took him. A sad story, and the regime used it naturally a terrible use at that time. The Egyptian media used it in a big way: "They kill the people of Islam, and kill the Sheikhs." The common people were annoyed. You as a simple Muslim... when we were in that stage we were simple youth, this news was very terrifying. When they kidnap Sheikh Al-Dhahabī and he is an Azhari Sheikh. I did not know who Sheikh Al-

Dhahabī was in that period; he is just an Azhari Sheikh and is the Minister of Endowments.

Meaning they came to the weakest link in the regime and killed him. After that it ended. Security surrounded them and eliminated them, and presented them for trial. Shukrī Muṣṭafā and most of the major leaders were executed. He debated them in the military court a strong debate. They brought him a group of scholars from Al-Azhar, they could not refute him. He was very terrible and discussing alone in the court. There were some lawyers and others who leaked old tapes. Dr. ʻAbdullāh Rashwān and others leaked some tapes. There were no MP3s and this technology and mobiles. So they brought out some of it and some people wrote, because his pleadings were recorded in the court, and it is a very strong pleading. If you do not have a good background in the creed of the *Khawārij*, you might be influenced by his words. Therefore he influenced many youths, for he was very strong and an influential personality as it is said.

So these appeared and still remain. And these who believe in the eternal punishment of the perpetrator of a major sin in the Fire, these still exist, whether in Egypt or in Algeria or in the Peninsula and in the Islamic world. A group of these who declare Takfir still exists as very dangerous sects in Islam.

We will take quick points on their doubts. And we will postpone the subject of the *Muʻtazilah* to the coming lecture, *in shā' Allāh*, because the *Muʻtazilah* also contain some refutations and many ramifications. But I will take points from these issues with the *Khawārij* specifically. Meaning regarding the *Khawārij*, they inferred with some evidences that the sinners are eternal in the Fire. And, *in shā' Allāh*, in the coming lecture we speak about the meaning of the Major Sin (*Kabīrah*), because some scholars said the Major Sin has no limit, and scholars differed greatly.

And in the book *Al-Kabā'ir* for example by Imam Al-Dhahabī, he tried to restrict major sins to seventy major sins. And we know in the Hadiths of the Seven Destructive Sins, major sins are seven or nine. Some restricted them to three hundred or four hundred major sins. Imam Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī in his book *Al-Zawājir ʻan Iqtidāf al-Kabā'ir* wrote more than about four hundred major sins approximately and divided them according to Fiqh chapters.

And scholars differed on it greatly: What is the Major Sin exactly? Is it the one entailing a threat (*waʻīd*)? Entailing a text with a *Ḥadd* (prescribed punishment)? Or there is a curse? Or recklessness with sins? Is there a division of minor and major sins? The majority of scholars say: Yes, there are minor and major sins:

إِن تَجْتَنِبُوا كَبَائِرَ مَا تُنْهَوْنَ عَنْهُ

"If you avoid the major sins which you are forbidden from..." [QS. An-Nisā': 31]

إِلَّا اللَّمَمَ

"Except for small faults." [QS. An-Najm: 32]

Meaning there are minor sins.

So the issues contain minor and major, this is confirmed speech. But there is no minor sin regarding the right of Allah; meaning everything, even if it was small, in the right of Allah is a big, repugnant thing. But from the perspective that a sin is bigger than a sin.

And they inferred by the saying of Allah the Exalted:

بَلَىٰ مَن كَسَبَ سَيِّئَةً وَأَحَاطَتْ بِهِ خَطِيئَتُهُ فَأُولَٰئِكَ أَصْحَابُ النَّارِ ۖ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ

"Yes, whoever earns a *sayyi'ah* (evil deed) and his sin has encompassed him - those are the companions of the Fire; they will abide therein eternally." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 81]

So, he is eternal in the Fire. They said the word *sayyi'ah* is indefinite in a general context. "Earns a *sayyi'ah*," meaning any *sayyi'ah*, meaning a sin. The meaning of that is that whoever commits a *sayyi'ah*, meaning a sin, is eternal in the Fire. They took this general text. Notice the *Khawārij* always infer with general texts and general speech.

And they inferred also with another text:

وَمَن يَعْصِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَيَتَعَدَّ حُدُودَهُ يُدْخِلْهُ نَارًا خَالِدًا فِيهَا وَلَهُ عَذَابٌ مُّهِينٌ

"And whoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger and transgresses His limits - He will put him into the Fire to abide eternally therein, and he will have a humiliating punishment." [QS. An-Nisā': 14]

They said: Disobeys Allah with any disobedience, then this one is eternal in the Fire if he dies upon that.

And also among things they inferred with, they said regarding the consumer of Usury (*Ribā*):

فَمَن جَاءَهُ مَوْعِظَةٌ مِّن رَّبِّهِ فَانتَهَىٰ فَلَهُ مَا سَلَفَ وَأَمْرُهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ ۖ وَمَنْ عَادَ فَأُولَٰئِكَ أَصْحَابُ النَّارِ ۖ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ

"So whoever has received an admonition from his Lord and desists may have what is past, and his affair rests with Allah. But whoever returns [to dealing in usury] - those are the companions of the Fire; they will abide eternally therein." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 275]

So it speaks about the consumer of Usury being eternal in the Fire, meaning the general text. And even:

وَمَن يَقْتُلْ مُؤْمِنًا مُّتَعَمِّدًا فَجَزَاؤُهُ جَهَنَّمُ خَالِدًا فِيهَا وَغَضِبَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَلَعَنَهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُ عَذَابًا عَظِيمًا

"But whoever kills a believer intentionally - his recompense is Hell, wherein he will abide eternally, and Allah has become angry with him and has cursed him and has prepared for him a great punishment." [QS. An-Nisā': 93]

And there are some Hadiths from the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* like: ("The severer of kinship ties will not enter Paradise"), ("The talebearer will not enter Paradise"); they took the general context like this. And ("Any slave who absconded from his master has disbelieved until he returns"). And ("Abusing a Muslim is *Fusūq* (immorality) and fighting him is *Kufr* (disbelief)"). These are the texts on which they relied. Even the text ("The fornicator does not fornicate while he is a believer"), ("The thief does not steal while he is a believer"), ("Nor does he drink alcohol when he drinks it while he is a believer"). So they said it means he is eternal in the Fire if he dies upon that.

But these general evidences, when you take them like this... We told you the Qur'an is one unit, and legislation is consistent with each other. But this is what they rely on: general evidences.

We come to the **Specific Evidences**, and this specific restricts the general:

Look at the evidences for example: Their reliance primarily on the issue of the saying of Allah the Exalted: (*But whoever kills a believer intentionally*). Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* says:

وَإِن طَائِفَتَانِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ اقْتَتَلُوا فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا

"And if two factions among the believers fight, then make settlement between the two." [QS. Al-Ḥujurāt: 9]

And the Hadith of the Ghāmidī woman who committed fornication and the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* established the *Ḥadd* upon her. And this man Mā‘iz who came, so he said to him: "Is there madness in you? Is there possession in you? Is there such in you?" Then the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: "Stone him." And these... even some of them when they said "Allah cursed her," he said: "Do not curse her, for she has repented a repentance that if it were distributed among the people of Medina it would suffice them." Also regarding the thief, even in (*Cut off the hands of both as a recompense for what they earned as a deterrent from Allah*) [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 38].

In discussing with *Ahl al-Sunnah*, they said: If the issue is that the thief enters the Fire eternally therein, and this one who drinks alcohol is eternal therein... The thief, if we stripped Faith from him and he becomes eternal in the Fire, then why is his hand cut off and why not his neck cut off? Killing him for apostasy because he is an apostate. So this is a *Ḥadd* because he is still a Muslim. The drinker of alcohol, why does he flog him and not kill him? Because in this case he did not exit the Millah, by mere sin that he drank alcohol. In this case, we, *Ahl al-Sunnah*, believe that even if he persisted, he does not disbelieve. Naturally, it does not mean recklessness. If he died upon that and persisted on the major sin and died upon it and did not repent, he is under the Will (*Mashī’ah*); if Allah wills He pardons him, and if He wills He punishes him, but He does not keep him eternally [in Hell]. Unlike the *Khawārij* who say he is kept eternally in the Fire forever.

Even regarding other evidences on which they relied. Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* named them brothers:

وَإِن طَائِفَتَانِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ اقْتَتَلُوا فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا ۖ فَإِن بَغَتْ إِحْدَاهُمَا عَلَى الْأُخْرَىٰ فَقَاتِلُوا الَّتِي تَبْغِي حَتَّىٰ تَفِيءَ إِلَىٰ أَمْرِ اللَّهِ ۚ فَإِن فَاءَتْ فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا بِالْعَدْلِ وَأَقْسِطُوا ۖ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ * إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ إِخْوَةٌ فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَ أَخَوَيْكُمْ

"And if two factions among the believers fight, then make settlement between the two. But if one of them oppresses the other, then fight against the one that oppresses until it returns to the ordinance of Allah. And if it returns, then make settlement between

them in justice and act justly. Indeed, Allah loves those who act justly. The believers are but brothers, so make settlement between your brothers." [QS. Al-Ḥujurāt: 9-10]

By Allah, would I call the killer a brother? "Make settlement between your disbelieving brothers"? But it is "make settlement between your believing brothers."

So these are the doubts among the *Khawārij*. Naturally there are very many doubts, but so as not to exhaust time, *in shā' Allāh*, we will complete in the coming lecture. And I gave you the basic titles in the coming lecture: The Fifth. Naturally we will have to take from the Fifth and speak about the *Mu'tazilah* and the doubts of the *Mu'tazilah* and the refutation, and some issues specific to the *Khawārij* too so we digest this issue entirely.

But you must in the end believe that *Ahl al-Sunnah* **do not declare Takfir due to sin**. We do not declare anyone a disbeliever for a sin as long as he does not make it lawful (*yastaḥilluhu*).

Meaning these big sins, like the sin of alcohol. He drank alcohol and made it lawful (*istaḥalla*), he disbelieves. If he drank it and did not make it lawful, he is a perpetrator of a major sin; he is flogged if presented to the judge. He died upon it like this and did not repent; according to us *Ahl al-Sunnah*, he is in the ruling of the Will (*Mashī'ah*); if Allah wills He punishes him, and if He wills He pardons him, and if He punishes him, He does not keep him eternally. This is the most important thing. I do not care about the doubts of the *Khawārij* and others, but I care about what we believe in this subject.

And we believe that Faith consists of three pillars: Affirmation by the *Janān* (Heart), Acknowledgment by the Tongue, and Action by the Limbs. The three combined; you cannot divide them from each other.

I ask Allah the Great, Lord of the Great Throne, to encompass us in His mercy. And may Allah bless you.

I say this saying of mine and I seek forgiveness from Allah for me and for you..

Wa al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh..

The Fifth Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allah; we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allah from the evils of our souls and our bad deeds. Whomever Allah guides, there is no one to misguide him, and whomever He leads astray, there is no guide for him. I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, alone with no partner, and that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ تُقَاتِهِ وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُم مُّسْلِمُونَ

"O you who have believed, fear Allah as He should be feared and do not die except as Muslims." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 102]

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُم مِّن نَّفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا وَبَثَّ مِنْهُمَا رِجَالًا كَثِيرًا وَنِسَاءً ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا

"O mankind, fear your Lord, who created you from one soul and created from it its mate and dispersed from both of them many men and women. And fear Allah, through whom you ask one another, and the wombs. Indeed Allah is ever, over you, an Observer." [QS. An-Nisā’: 1]

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَقُولُوا قَوْلًا سَدِيدًا * يُصْلِحْ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ ۗ وَمَن يُطِعِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيمًا

"O you who have believed, fear Allah and speak words of appropriate justice. He will [then] amend for you your deeds and forgive you your sins. And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has certainly attained a great attainment." [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 70-71]

To proceed:

The most truthful speech is the Book of Allah, and the best guidance is the guidance of Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. And the worst of matters are their innovations, and every innovation is a heresy, and every heresy is a misguidance, and every misguidance is in the Fire.

Honored brothers, here we are with the second day of the month of Dhūl-Ḥijjah for the year 1432 of the blessed Prophetic Hijrah. And we are

also with the **Fifth Lesson** of the Sharia course titled: *Masā'il fī al-Īmān* (Issues Regarding Faith).

Today, *in shā' Allāh*, we will speak about the **Mu'tazilah** as a sect that opposed *Ahl al-Sunnah* in many things and agreed with them in specific details. But we must become acquainted with this sect with a quick overview and a quick look. Otherwise, for example, when we spoke in the past Fourth Lesson about the *Khawārij*, we did not give them their due right, and we spoke only about important issues regarding the *Khawārij*. But we will speak later about what combines the *Mu'tazilah* and *Khawārij*; because the *Mu'tazilah* and *Khawārij* agree on certain principles, even if they differ with each other in many things. Even the *Mu'tazilah* among themselves split into more than twenty sects, these are the main sects, but there are sects among them that split into eleven sects for a single sect. Meaning you will find these sects splitting and dividing into a very large group of sects.

We will speak about the early *Mu'tazilah* or the famous sects among the *Khawārij*, but they have sects which are branches and protrusions like this from the sects, gathered by general principles. This is what we will speak about today, *in shā' Allāh*.

The Mu'tazilah:

Naturally, I will not start with specific texts on Faith today because the subject of the *Mu'tazilah* requires very strong concentration in the beginning. And some texts, especially regarding the *Khawārij*, I will postpone to the end of the lecture, *in shā' Allāh*.

As for the *Mu'tazilah*, we will learn today about the origin of this *Mu'tazilah* and how and when it appeared. We also speak about the most important sects of the *Mu'tazilah* because it is not a single sect. And we speak about the basic principles such that a man is not called a Mu'tazili unless he believes in these famous principles of theirs.

This is despite the fact that the course on Faith speaks only about the subject of the *Mu'tazilah* and their relationship to the perpetrators of a major sin and the definition of Faith. But in the manner of ("Its water is purifying, its dead animals are lawful"), we will add some special information regarding this dangerous sect because it has an impact on our reality. And because there are scholars and famous personalities among Muslim scholars specifically who care about this sect and believe that it is the one that liberated the mind (*'aql*) and gave the individual freedom in action. Even Sheikh Muḥammad 'Abduh, the former Mufti of Egypt, when he was reviving and glorifying the *Mu'tazilah*, a glorification we believe is

unjustified because we will find the reality of this *Mu'tazilah* has slogans of utmost danger if we applied them.

Therefore, you find that the scope of attacking Islam always comes from these sects, the sects of the people of innovation. You find for example these secularists care much about these sects; Marxists care about them and revive these sects and glorify them considering them an entrance to attack Islam; due to the abundance of glorification of the mind (*'aql*) among the *Mu'tazilah*. People were infatuated with them. When secularism appeared in the West, some scholars tried to fabricate and say "We have [rationalism] and we preceded you in glorifying the mind and believed in glorifying the mind." So they revived the books of the *Mu'tazilah*, especially the Orientalists who published the books of these sects. And the thread is still running regarding attacking the religion, especially in this field. We will refute these very dangerous sayings in the religion through some opinions of these people.

Regarding the *Mu'tazilah*, **First:** The basic references for talking about these sects are famous known books: *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* by Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī[2], *Al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* by Al-Shahrastānī, *Al-Fiṣal* by Ibn Ḥazm, and *Ṭabaqāt al-Mu'tazilah* by Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā ibn Murtaḍā, he is called "The Imam" among the Zaydis and is one of the Imams of the Zaydi Shiites, he wrote *Ṭabaqāt al-Mu'tazilah* and died in the year 840 AH. And Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār, who is also one of the Imams of the *Mu'tazilah*, has the book *Faḍl al-I'tizāl wa Ṭabaqāt al-Mu'tazilah*, and he has many books.

These are the basic references. There are other references in history books; you will find *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* by Ibn Kathīr, *Tārīkh al-Islām* by Al-Dhahabī. And biographical books like *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* mentioned most Imams of these schools and spoke about them. All these sources combined are sources for sects.

Then we come to contemporary books like *Madhāhib al-Islāmiyyīn* by Dr. Muṣṭafā al-Shak'ah, and Dr. Suhayl Zakkār and others who wrote about the Qarmatians. These books are many and contemporary. However, there are some who steal these ideas and publish them in their name although he does not offer anything, he takes cut and paste! But these books, if you want to know something about sects, return to the books, and the books are printed, *alḥamdulillāh*. The scientific reference material and sources of these sects exist, and they have books and followers to this day of ours.

[2] Correct author is 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī

Regarding the *Mu'tazilah*, they appeared originally in the days of the Umayyad State. This was in the days of Imam Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, who is a famous Imam among the Imams of *Ahl al-Sunnah* and died in the year 110 AH, in the same year in which the great scholar Ibn Sīrīn died, to whom dream interpretation is attributed; this one died before him by about three months. Imam Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī was giving a circle and people were attending with him, because *I'tizāl* and innovations appeared from Basra. The beginning of the calamity appeared from there.

All calamities appeared from there, by the way, from the region of Iraq; all *Fitnahs* and problems. Therefore you find the mothers of sects appearing from there. And the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said: "The *Fitnahs* are from right here," meaning the East. Iraq is where these sects appeared because it was on the touchstone and was subordinate to the Persians in the past, and the Muslims opened it, led by Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ in the days of our master Abū Bakr and our master 'Umar, *raḍiyallāhu 'anhum*. Therefore, when their state collapsed, there appeared the influence of argumentation and ancient religions, so they introduced these and were influenced by them. Among them are those who were influenced intentionally or tried to homogenize with the *Zanādiqah* about whom we spoke. And among them are those who were influenced out of ignorance, so became Arabized in this way that is raised among the Dualists (*Mathnawiyyah*) and Zoroastrian religions and others which were among the Persians in the past.

But the witness here is that Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī was in the mosque sitting giving his lesson. A man entered, as Al-Shahrastānī says, and said to him: "O Imam of the Religion, there has appeared in our time a group who declare the perpetrators of major sins disbelievers. The major sin according to them is disbelief (*Kufr*) that expels from the Millah, and they are the **Wa'īdiyyah** (Threateners) of the *Khawārij*. And a group who postpone (*yurji'ūn*) the perpetrators of major sins; and the major sin according to them does not harm with Faith. Rather, action according to their *Madhhab* is not a pillar of Faith, and disobedience does not harm with Faith just as obedience does not benefit with Disbelief. And they are the **Murji'ah** of the Ummah. So how do you judge for us regarding that as a creed?" This is the text of the question.

So, a man entered upon Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī in his circle in the mosque while he was giving the lesson and said this saying to him: "O Imam of the Religion, two sects appeared in our days; a sect declaring Takfir by major sin, and a sect postponing, saying disobedience does not harm with Faith, and it is the *Murji'ah*, meaning just as obedience does not benefit with Disbelief, two opposing sides. So what do you say? You, in

your creed, what should we do? Incline to this or that?" This indicates that the sect of the *Khawārij* is the oldest sect that appeared in Islam, the first sect, then after that the *Mu‘tazilah*, then the *Rāfiḍah* and others; because the *Rāfiḍah* appeared after that.

So the *Khawārij*, their beginning was in the days of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, then they appeared also in the issue of Arbitration in the year 37 AH. Meaning the oldest sect in the history of Islam that appeared and caused this rift and this dispute is the *Khawārij*. Then the *Mu‘tazilah* appeared and were influenced by the *Khawārij* in some issues. But what did Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī say? Al-Ḥasan pondered the question, and before he could answer, **Wāṣil ibn ‘Aṭā’ al-Ghazzāl** spoke, this student who is the owner of the *Mu‘tazilah*, it is almost attributed to him that he founded these ideas, and established the idea of the Position between the Two Positions. He died in the year 130 AH. He had a lisp (*aldagh*), meaning he could not pronounce the 'R' (*Rā’*) correctly. He has a famous sermon when the Governor of Basra invited him in that period; it is said ‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz invited him, and he was a governor at that time.

Meaning the teacher was sitting and he did not give him time. So the student stood up, and he is Wāṣil ibn ‘Aṭā’, and said: "I do not say that the owner of a major sin is a believer absolutely nor a disbeliever absolutely; rather he is in a position between the two positions, neither a believer nor a disbeliever." Then he stood up and withdrew (*i‘tazala*) to a pillar of the pillars of the mosque to decide what he answered, and gathered people. Naturally, how does he say this while his Sheikh is sitting and did not speak? He is the one who answered that. So Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī expelled him when he spoke. And it was said that he stood up to another pillar corner in the mosque and a group of people gathered around him, among them **‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd**, the famous Mu'tazili. He was also among the ascetics and worshippers. Imagine, this ‘Amr denied *Qadar* (Divine Decree) and attacked the Companions, rather declared them *Fāsiq* (immoral) and did not accept their testimony. Very dangerous, this man. And he is counted among worshippers and ascetics. He used to enter upon Abū Ja‘far al-Manṣūr in the days of the Abbasid State, and he would honor him greatly. People used to say "This is an innovator." Abū Ja‘far al-Manṣūr used to give, people would take and seek [wealth], scholars... as for this one, he would not accept gifts or money from the Caliph. The Caliphs used to love the one who renounced what they had. Therefore he used to say: "All of them seek the game (prey) except ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd." Meaning all of them want money except ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd.

So people were infatuated with him although he was among the most severe people in innovation, danger, and *Fisq*. He insulted the Companions, this innovator; they called him the Misguided Innovator. So let us not be deceived by asceticism as I told you, because asceticism and false piety sometimes harm and cause severe *Fitnahs*, and this happened in the history of Islam unfortunately.

So Al-Ḥasan said: "**Wāṣil has withdrawn form us** (*I'tazalanā Wāṣil*)," or "**Withdrew from us**." So they were named **Mu'tazilah** due to the saying of Imam Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī to Wāṣil ibn 'Aṭā', and this is the famous [reason]. And it was said the reason for naming is that they withdrew from the Ummah in its ideas, principles, and beliefs, and opposed the Ummah in many things, so were named *Mu'tazilah*. But this reason is the beginning, and the famous reason is the incident that happened in the Mosque of Basra at the hands of Imam Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. The real founder of the *Mu'tazilah* is Wāṣil ibn 'Aṭā'.

So this is the beginning of the sect of the *Mu'tazilah*. They have many sects, they split into 20 sects. And most of these sects declare each other disbelievers. I will give you famous examples, I cannot count all sects. The famous sects are: **The Wāṣiliyyah**, meaning attributed to Wāṣil ibn 'Aṭā'. And **The 'Amrawiyyah**, attributed to 'Amr ibn 'Ubayd. And **The Khābiṭiyyah** to one named Muḥammad ibn Khābiṭ. And **The Ḥimāriyyah**. The Ḥimāriyyah and Khābiṭiyyah are among the extremists of the *Mu'tazilah*; the *Mu'tazilah* declared them disbelievers before *Ahl al-Sunnah*. Because these Khābiṭiyyah said that Allah will send a non-Arab Prophet, and this non-Arab Prophet has a book existing in the heaven, a complete Qur'an meaning, that will descend upon this non-Arab. Naturally the scholars declared them disbelievers and said there is no book except the Book of Allah, and Prophethood was sealed with Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*. Even the *Mu'tazilah* declared them disbelievers. Scholars called him among the extremists exiting Islam. This sect Khābiṭiyyah and Ḥimāriyyah are like them from their name; meaning imagine "Ḥimāriyyah" (Donkey-sect), what will you say meaning..!

And you have among the sects **The Hudhayliyyah** attributed to Abū Hudhayl al-'Allāf, the famous one. And there is **The Naẓẓāmiyyah**. And there is **The Iskāfiyyah**. And there is **The Jāḥiẓiyyah**, and they are followers of Al-Jāḥiẓ, the famous author of *Al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn* and *Al-Ḥayawān*, and he has many books. He died in the year 255 AH and was a Mu'tazili. He had much humor and was ugly; he mocks greatly and ridicules the commoners and ridicules people and so on. In the book *Al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn* you will find this ridicule and mockery. And he has beliefs, he was of deviant creed. This Al-Jāḥiẓ whom they glorify in

literature books, yes, he has in literature books something witty like *Kitāb al-Bukhalā’*, but in creed he is of deviant belief. And he has a sect named the Jāḥiẓiyyah.

And also there is **The Ja‘fariyyah**, **The Bishriyyah**, **The Ka‘biyyah**, **The Bahshamiyyah**, **The Murīsiyyah**, and **The Hishāmiyyah**; meaning names all attributed to the founder.

And every sect in detail, you will find them in the books of sects, whether *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* by ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī, or *Al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* by Al-Shahrastānī, or *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* by Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī. These are the main books of sects. There are modern books printed, you find seriousness in them and find high effort in them; because when he comes to author a book on the *Mu‘tazilah*, he says "Mu'tazilah of Basra" and speaks about them, because there are Mu'tazilah of Baghdad, and gives you the ideas and the difference between them and Mu'tazilah of Baghdad. So you feel there is scientific value in the research. As for the one who takes cut and paste, where is the scientific value? Where do you discuss in this?!

So these are the mother books of sects. Twenty sects, these are the famous sects.

Therefore, the *Mu‘tazilah*, when they spoke with this principle: The Position between the Two Positions regarding perpetrators of major sins, some scholars said: No, he is an absolute disbeliever because he has [no] faith, nor is he an absolute believer. Meaning neither an absolute disbeliever nor an absolute believer. So he is a *Fāsiq* (immoral) between the two positions. "Okay, *Fāsiq* means what?" We said he is treated with the treatment of this world; meaning one can marry from him, and deal with him normal dealings as a Muslim, and he is not warred against nor fought. This is the difference between them and the *Khawārij*. But if he dies, in the Hereafter they say he enters the Fire.

Therefore, scholars in the past called them "**The Effeminates of the Khawārij**" (*Makhānīth al-Khawārij*). These terminologies used to be said in the past. Scholars said it about the *Jahmiyyah*, they said: "Effeminates of the Jahmiyyah." So these "Effeminates of the Khawārij", why?! For those who do not know the meaning of *Makhānīth*, it is from *Khunthā* (Hermaphrodite). The *Khunthā* is the one born and we do not know is he male or female, in between. Sometimes he is born with a male organ but it is weak, and sometimes born with both together. So we do not know whether to treat him as male or female. His appearance is male but he is female, and sometimes appearance is female and he is male, and sometimes both together. So he is neither a man nor a female, he is *Khunthā*. So the

scholars, by way of sarcasm against the *Mu'tazilah*, said to them: "Effeminates of the Khawārij." Why? For the *Khawārij* were explicit men; they declared Takfir and rested. He said the *Murji'* is a disbeliever and inside the Fire, and they were fighting the people of Islam. They fought our master ʻAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, and fought the Imams and Companions, and fought the Successors and states of Islam, and said they are disbelievers, and they were consistent with themselves.

As for the *Mu'tazilah*, they are merely colorful manipulators. Meaning he says in the Hereafter he is inside the Fire, but in this world I treat him as a Muslim but I do not say about him "Muslim" nor "Believer," and I say about him "*Fāsiq*." And they did not fight for that, nor declare war nor fight like the *Khawārij*. The *Khawārij* fought and defended. Therefore they called them effeminates because they are unclear. These terminologies are witty among the scholars in the past by way of sarcasm against them.

And also the *Mu'tazilah* have **Five Principles and Fundamentals**. These five principles and fundamentals, you hardly find a Mu'tazili who does not believe in these principles. How did they decide these principles? Through arguments and debates. Even the Mu'tazilah of Basra and Mu'tazilah of Baghdad used to debate among themselves in these matters. Therefore, these five principles were generated from them in the end. Therefore Qāḍī ʻAbd al-Jabbār explained them later in a large huge book *Sharḥ al-Uṣūl al-Khamsah*.

What are the Five Principles?

The First Principle for them: **Tawhid** (Monotheism).

The Second Principle: ʻAdl (Justice).

The Third Principle: Al-Waʻd wa al-Waʻīd (The Promise and the Threat).

The Fourth Principle: Al-Manzilah bayn al-Manzilatayn (The Position between the Two Positions).

The Fifth Principle: Al-Amr bi al-Maʻrūf wa al-Nahy ʻan al-Munkar (Enjoining Good and Forbidding Evil).

These five principles, there is no Mu'tazili who does not believe in them.

"**Tawhid**" for them... these are terminologies, do not be deceived by them. The books of secularists in our days glorify these things. And what they describe them with as "Republican Revolutionaries" because they do not stipulate Qurashi lineage, and that they are liberated and have nothing.

And they are the first people who appointed a woman as leader over themselves. In a Hadith from Al-Bukhārī ("A people will not succeed who entrust their affair to a woman"). The *Khawārij* are the first who entrusted their affair to a woman, **Ghazālah**, who was fighting Al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf. We tell you some anecdotes; when her husband Shabīb died, they appointed her. She was veiled (*mulaththamah*) and used to dress like a man and was a fighter. The *Khawārij* used to teach their women fighting; because they are a minority and sects always feel persecuted, and because there is much raiding upon them and they fear for their women. So they used to teach them equestrianism too. They used to withdraw to places and fight. The woman used to fight like the man among them so that if they clashed with their opponents... Therefore they appointed this one as a leader/princess. Therefore these defeated ones rejoice at such things, that they appointed a woman over them. And what next? She failed and destroyed, and they became a trace after an eye (utterly destroyed). This is what happened to the *Khawārij*.

Important, when they speak about the *Mu'tazilah*, they have more glorification. Meaning they revive the *Khawārij* because they are Republicans and Revolutionaries. As for the *Mu'tazilah*, they are the people of Enlightened Thought, and they are the ones who revived Free Action, and the servant is free in his deed and his will, and freedom of will and action for the servant, and that the servant creates his deed. These are pure **Qadariyyah**. *Qadarī* does not mean he believes in *Qadar* (Divine Decree), but means he denies *Qadar*, denies that Allah creates the actions of servants. Meaning he says these actions are attributed to me, not to Allah, far be it from Allah. Therefore Imam Al-Bukhārī, and he died in the year 256 AH[3] meaning in the days of the Abbasid State, Imam Al-Bukhārī wrote the book *Khalq Af'āl al-'Ibād* (Creation of the Actions of Servants) as a refutation of all these *Mu'tazilah* and other *Qadariyyah*.

And **Tawhid** was a refutation of the *Mushabbihah* (Anthropomorphists) and *Mujassimah* (Corporealists), so they refuted them with Tawhid.

And **Justice** (*'Adl*), they refuted the *Jahmiyyah*, because they differed with the *Jahmiyyah* although they agreed with them in some opinions.

In **The Promise and the Threat**, they refuted the *Murji'ah* and the issue of the ruling on the perpetrator of a major sin.

[3] Text says 206, correct date is 256 AH.

And in **The Position between the Two Positions**, they refuted the *Khawārij* because the *Khawārij* used to say it is one position: the Fire.

In **Enjoining Good and Forbidding Evil**, this principle was in their dispute with the Imami Shiites because they do not enjoin good nor forbid evil [in the same way/context].

These are the five general principles for them. And they are taught in the Faculty of Arts, Philosophy Department, and for secondary students, Philosophy Department. When they mention the sects of Muslims, always notice in philosophy books or in sects, he mentions *Ahl al-Sunnah* as a sect taking two or three lines. Then he comes to the *Mu'tazilah* and praises it. Then the student comes believing they are the people of truth. They were influenced by this. Meaning read philosophy books from the past or those taught in secondary schools across the Arab world, you find the philosophy subject containing this material on sects and the difference between them, you find glorification of the *Mu'tazilah*; because most philosophers came from the *Mu'tazilah*. Most philosophers who were influenced by Greek philosophy are the ones who were surrounding Caliph Al-Ma'mūn, they are from the *Mu'tazilah*. Those who translated the books of the Greeks are the *Mu'tazilah*. The scholars like Aḥmad ibn Du'ād the Judge, and with him the scholars surrounding him, and even the vizier Ibn al-Zayyāt and others; all these from the *Mu'tazilah* came to have authority.

Caliph Al-Ma'mūn in the end of his life adopted the thought of the *Mu'tazilah* although he was Zaydi. He adopted their ideas and tested the Ummah with a heinous crime and an innovation that caused the killing of many scholars and their imprisonment. The end of the days of Caliph Al-Ma'mūn who died 218 AH. Then came after him Caliph Al-Mu'taṣim Billāh, died in the year 227 AH. Then came after him Caliph Al-Wāthiq. Caliph Al-Amīn was before Al-Ma'mūn, ruled 4 years, and *Fitnah* happened between them. These [groups] supported him in the regions of Transoxiana and others because they believed the *Madhhab* of Zaydism and Shiism and people of *Fitnah*, so they were enthusiastic for Al-Ma'mūn and destroyed Al-Amīn, and Al-Amīn was killed.

But the witness here is that the State turned to the innovation of **Creation of the Qur'an**. In the Mu'tazilah of Basra, it was merely verbal debates and the matter ended. As for the Mu'tazilah of Baghdad, the matter for them turned into authority. They were close to the Caliphate as it was in Baghdad. They sought help from the Caliph and convinced the Caliph that this is the Truth. The Caliphs were always fighting and striving despite these calamities with Al-Ma'mūn and others, yet they strive and their armies are spread. Therefore scholars in the past like Imam Aḥmad ibn

Ḥanbal did not declare Al-Ma’mūn disbeliever, nor Al-Mu‘taṣim, nor even Al-Wāthiq. Because he said they protect the territory of Islam and defend the religion. And he considered them ignorant and that Ibn Abī Du’ād influenced them. Meaning he excused them and said: "These are their armies going out and liberating and conquering conquests, so how do I declare these disbelievers?" Meaning these were opening lands and people were entering the religion of Allah. Therefore Imam Aḥmad did not declare these Caliphs disbelievers despite these innovations, and did not incite war against them at that time.

Therefore our Lord punished them in the days of Caliph Al-Mutawakkil who came after the death of Caliph Al-Wāthiq. It was said Al-Wāthiq repented from the issue of the Creation of the Qur'an in the end of his life, but he was oppressive, increasing in tyranny severely, and did not live long. But Caliph Al-Mutawakkil came and supported *Ahl al-Sunnah* and supported the Truth and extinguished this and prevented this innovation of Creation of the Qur'an. People used to exchange prisoners; coming to the borders between him and Turkey for example or the lands of the Romans, standing on a bridge. These are prisoners of the Christian Roman disbelievers and these are prisoners of Muslims. They ask the prisoner: "What do you say about the creation of the Qur'an? Is the Qur'an created or uncreated?" If he said the Qur'an is uncreated, he said: "Take him!" Imagine, leaving him with the Christians! They test people on this.

And scholars adopted tricks because the issue is very dangerous, so he says "Yes, he answered with such." Because they pitied the people. Some governors also had sympathy, especially the governors of Shām were sympathetic. In Baghdad they were the ones controlling the state and close to the Caliphate. Naturally, eyes and reports would come against them, therefore they were very severe. They tortured Imam Al-Buwayṭī, an Imam of the Egyptian jurists, an Imam who was killed as a martyr. And Imam Abū Nu‘aym and others. Virtuous people were killed due to the *Fitnah* of Creation of the Qur'an. We say the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah* is that the Qur'an is not created and the Qur'an is the Speech of Allah. But they said the Qur'an is created and entered people into a maze.

A scholar was brought to Caliph Al-Wāthiq, and he had Ibn Abī Du’ād and the masters of scholars. Ibn Abī Du’ād, this dangerous Judge, a scholar, jurist, poet, litterateur, not easy meaning. So he said to him: "What do you say regarding the Qur'an? Created or uncreated?" The scholar said to him: "Do you give me safety in answering?" The Caliph said: "Yes, I give you safety, we will not betray you, answer frankly." He said to him: "**This question, did the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* know it or did he not know it?**" So they were confused. They said:

"Answer!" If he said he knew it, he would say: "If he knew it, why does he hide it from the Ummah, while this is a general calamity by which people are tested involving disbelief and faith?" And if he said the Messenger did not know it, he accused the Messenger of not knowing and that he [the claimant] knows better than the Messenger. Our Lord empowered this Sheikh over them, so he was shrewder than them. Our Lord guided him to this. The Caliph is neutral, not enthusiastic for this or that. He said: "Answer, O Ibn Abī Du'ād! And to the scholars, this is a man alone, answer him!" They are the Ministers and have power. They said to him: "Skip this question." It influenced the Caliph. He said: "Ask a second question."

He said: "**The Companions of the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* and the Caliphs after him found it sufficient that they did not ask the Ummah about this. Did not what sufficed them suffice you?**" The Caliph struck his leg on the ground and said: "Indeed! Did not what sufficed them suffice me?!" And he remained very annoyed by this. Therefore it was said that Caliph Al-Wāthiq recanted in the end from the issue of the Creation of the Qur'an due to a man, a Sheikh whose name is hardly mentioned. This Sheikh is the one who debated Ibn Abī Du'ād. There is a book named *Al-Ḥaydah wa al-I'tidhār* and others, containing very many debates in this matter. But the witness here is that he addressed them with the likes of their method.

Therefore, the hardest thing to argue with people of innovation is to address them with the Qur'an; because he believes in the Qur'an. But address him with binding argument (*Ilzām*). So this Sheikh bound him: "If the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* knew and did not inform his Ummah and test them in this subject, you test them and declare them disbelievers?! Meaning it is a great issue in creed, how did the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* not convey it? And the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* does not remain silent about falsehood. And if he does not know, then you know and the Messenger does not know? And did not what sufficed Abū Bakr and 'Umar and 'Uthmān and all these righteous ones suffice you?"

Therefore, the power of Ibn Abī Du'ād and the power of the *Mu'tazilah* subsided afterwards. But Caliph Al-Wāthiq died. Then after him came Caliph Al-Mutawakkil 'alā Allāh, the Abbasid Caliph. He is the one who extinguished this, issued decrees, and launched a fierce war against the people of innovation. Therefore they hate him. The *Mu'tazilah* hate him and the *Rāfiḍah* hate him because he is the one who demolished the shrines and innovations for them. He extinguished it even in Egypt and in all the Caliphate State, after they had power in the days of Al-Ma'mūn

due to the Shiite inclinations of Al-Ma’mūn. So he extinguished all that; therefore those called Neo-Secularists hate him.

Therefore you find some of those called Thinkers... good in refuting secularists, the man is very good in refutations, but the trace of the *Mu‘tazilah* and love of the *Mu‘tazilah* is still with him. When we speak about **Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī, Ṣāḥib al-Zanj** (Leader of the Zanj), this one who destroyed, killed, shed blood, raped the free Hashemite women and sold them to the Zanj. This famous Zanj Rebellion that happened in Basra, and destroyed the Caliphate State for a long period, more than eighteen years, about twenty years approximately. Despite that, this one is praised and considered among the hero revolutionaries, and they consider them Islamic revolutionaries! In a book by Dr. Muḥammad ‘Imārah, he glorifies this man. I refuted him ten years ago in a book *Thawrat al-Zanj*. I have a large huge article, a booklet named *Thawrat al-Zanj* in refutation of Dr. ‘Imārah in his praising of this criminal tyrant. Secularists praise this criminal. In the books of Dr. Muḥammad ‘Imārah and in his programs on Iqraa Channel and others, when he comes to Caliph Al-Mutawakkil, he turns a blind eye to him and speaks ill of him, and speaks about him as if he is a textualist man who does not understand and has none of the intellect of the Caliphs, and that his fathers were better than him.

Better than him in what, in *Fitnah*?! You say the *Mu‘tazilah* were people of intellects and liberated the mind. What mind is this?! They fought people, used to question people even exposing them to *Fitnahs* in the lands of the Romans. The prisoner is asked, and he who does not answer as the *Mu‘tazilah* answer... What freedom of mind is this that those who praise the *Mu‘tazilah* speak about?! You praise them for freedom of mind? When they assumed authority, they used authority to oppress others. They humiliated the scholars and jurists, the prides of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, the prides of Muslim scholars who were in that era, they humiliated them. Look at Imam Aḥmad when they tie him, torture him, and flog him. How he was flogged! They mount them on a donkey or camel from Egypt to Baghdad, Imam Al-Buwayṭī and some scholars, mounting him bound with chains and shackles, so that the man says "The Qur'an is created." The Governor of Egypt comes and tells him: "O Imam, say anything," because the Governor was sympathetic to Imam Al-Buwayṭī and others. He said to him: "By Allah, I will not deceive the Ummah of Muḥammad. If I said this and the students hear me, how can I take a concession?" And Imam Aḥmad likewise used to say to Ibn Ma‘īn and others: "If we take concessions, then how will the religion be taken after that?" If every scholar said: "I am compelled," the poor commoner will not take a concession, rather he will renounce the religion and leave the religion.

He says to you: "I am persecuted, I am afraid to be fired from my job." We saw those who dilute the religion. We saw the one saying for the sake of a Green Card, for the sake of a Visa, it is permissible for the soldier to join the American army to strike the Afghans in 2001! Do you remember the famous "American Fatwa"? Due to these concessions. Is this an excuse for the soldier?! Because he wants to live in America, to show citizenship. For the sake of citizenship, for the sake of a Green Card, for the sake of nationality, I kill this poor poor Muslim Afghan so that this one lives luxuriously and eats hamburgers! For this he takes a concession?! Although in the Sharia, the punishment of the compelled (*mukrah*) and the compeller (*mukrih*) is equal [in retaliation if killing occurs]; meaning if he put a gun and said to you: "I will kill you if you do not kill so-and-so." If you killed so-and-so, you and he are equal. Why? Because your life is not more precious than his life. He says to you: "If I do not kill him he will kill me." Well, let him kill you, why kill him? This is by consensus of jurists, there is no excuse in it.

The only case is possible if one hit you with a gun and said to you "Hit him, wound him, torture him, do anything without taking life, otherwise I will kill you." Although this is a great sin too, but it does not involve taking life.

I mean that taking concessions a lot, this is what loses the religion and dilutes the religion. Therefore scholars did not take concessions. When you come to discuss in our days, he says to you: "How do scholars do this?!" People might fault Imam Aḥmad. "Imam Aḥmad, how does he do this?" People in our days say to him: "The Sharia is not applied, people rule by Napoleon's laws, people rule by America's laws, people legislate Usury." He says to you: "He is excused!" Look at Imam Aḥmad. Imam Yaḥyā ibn Ma'īn was exposed to the *Fitnah* of Creation of the Qur'an and did not declare openly, and equivocated with equivocations. And Imam Aḥmad, if he equivocated like him, he is excused too.

But neither the Caliphs nor the early *Mu'tazilah* wanted the Sharia to be changed. Rather their intention was to purify the Sharia. This misguidance befell them because they wanted to purify the Sharia. Even the *Jahmiyyah* used to interpret things. Therefore, scholars did not declare them disbelievers. Why? Because they have the doubt of Interpretation (*Ta'wīl*). We will speak about this in the doubts later, *in shā' Allāh*.

So this is regarding the Five Principles. There are some things that gathered all sects. I give you some very important points so you understand who the *Mu'tazilah* are. The *Mu'tazilah* have other calamities as Al-Baghdādī and others said refuting them when he said "From their

misguidances." What unites the *Mu‘tazilah* are the following points. These sects, except the Khābiṭiyyah and Ḥimāriyyah, the authors of *Al-Firaq* called them "Scandals" (*Faḍā’iḥ*). Sheikh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz called them scandals, and Al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī called them **Scandals of the Mu‘tazilah**:

All these sects deny from Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla* His eternal attributes. And their saying that Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla* has no Knowledge, no Power, no Life, no Hearing, no Sight. And they added to this by saying: That Allah the Exalted did not have in eternity a name nor an attribute. *Ma‘ādh Allāh*.

From their calamities also: Impossibility of seeing Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla* with eyes. And they claimed He does not see Himself nor does other than Him see Him. And they differed in it: Is He seeing of other than Him or not? *A‘ūdhu billāh*, meaning imagine they speak about Allah, Creator of heavens and earth, Creator of all these great creatures with this boldness!

And among them is their agreement on the saying of the temporal origination (*ḥudūth*) of Allah's Speech, and temporal origination of His command, prohibition, and report. All of them claim that the Speech of Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla* is temporally originated (*ḥādith*). And most of them today name His Speech created (*makhlūq*). What is the meaning that His Speech is *ḥādith*? Meaning the Qur'an is created, meaning Allah's Speech is created. They intend that meaning. And their saying entirely that Allah the Exalted is not the Creator of people's bodies nor anything of animals' actions. And they claimed that people are the ones who determine (*yuqaddirūn*). Meaning Allah did not create the actions of servants, meaning you create your actions. These invalidated the like of that. The *Qadariyyah*, they used to call them the **Magi of the Ummah** (*Majūs al-Ummah*); because the Magi used to believe in a God of Evil and a God of Good, Light and Darkness; Light is creator of every good and Darkness does every evil. So it means these resemble them in that Allah creates pure good, while evil He does not create. Well, Allah is the One who created Jibrīl and created Iblīs, and created good and created evil. Allah who created life and created death. He who can create this creates this. So they deny that from Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā*.

And among them is their agreement on their claim regarding the *Fāsiq* (immoral) from the Ummah of Islam that he has a **Position between Two Positions**, which we spoke about.

And there are things also said by the **Wāṣiliyyah**, followers of Wāṣil ibn ‘Aṭā’ al-Ghazzāl, the head of the *Mu‘tazilah* and the leader of great innovation. And naturally influenced by Ma‘bad the Jahmi and others

from the old *Qadariyyah*, he and ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd. This ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd and Wāṣil ibn ‘Aṭā’ said: The Companions who differed with each other whether in the Camel or Ṣiffīn, they called them *Fāsiqīn*. The *Khawārij* declared them disbelievers. As for these, they lead in the end to disbelief in the Hereafter but describe him with *Fisq*. Therefore they say, look at the boldness of this ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd and Wāṣil!: "If ‘Alī or Ṭalḥah came and testified before me regarding a bunch of vegetables —a bundle of onion or radish or arugula—, I would not accept their testimony." *A‘ūdhu billāh*, imagine! He declares both parties *Fāsiq* indefinitely meaning. "But if two from the two parties came to me, I do not accept their testimony because I do not know which of them is the *Fāsiq* exactly."

And we have a calamity named **Abū Hudhayl al-‘Allāf**. This one insulted the Companions and insulted the Jurists of the Ummah and the Successors, and insulted our master Abū Hurayrah and attacked our master ‘Umar. And he and Al-Naẓẓām used to incline towards the Shiites in the idea of Shiism. Therefore... and therefore some scholars among them, Glory be to Allah, declared him disbeliever, due to some statements because he said very strange things.

Abū Hudhayl al-‘Allāf died in the year 237 AH, and some say 235 AH. Abū Hudhayl, most of the *Mu‘tazilah* declared him disbeliever. The *Mu‘tazilah* declared him disbeliever too, although he is a Sheikh among the great Sheikhs of the *Mu‘tazilah*. Because he said that the things decreed by Allah will perish (*tafnā*), and that Allah cannot cause life and cause death [after that], and Paradise and Hell will be in a state of stillness (*sukūn*) and the matter ends. Meaning everything after people enter Paradise and Hell will perish. Naturally the *Jahmiyyah* spoke of the perishing of Paradise and Hell, and maybe our Lord creates again. We say as *Ahl al-Sunnah* they are existing and created, we believe in this. Allah says:

وَجَنَّةٍ عَرْضُهَا السَّمَاوَاتُ وَالْأَرْضُ أُعِدَّتْ لِلْمُتَّقِينَ

> "And a Paradise as vast as the heavens and the earth, prepared for the righteous." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 133]

"Prepared" means existing. So they speak of the perishing of Paradise and Hell.

The *Mu‘tazilah* say: All these things will perish and Paradise and Hell will happen to them stillness.

And this Abū Hudhayl al-‘Allāf, Allah empowered his mind against him. He had a mighty mind but in falsehood. Meaning for very strange things. And the group refuted him. Also **Al-Naẓẓām**, the nephew of Al-

‘Allāf, died 223 AH approximately or 221. And this Al-Naẓẓām is the Sheikh of Al-Jāḥiẓ. A lineage of innovators and misguided ones bequeathing misguidance to each other. But Al-‘Allāf declared Al-Naẓẓām disbeliever. He declared his nephew disbeliever because he spoke of another strange special thing. Meaning this is disbeliever in one thing and the other declared him disbeliever in another thing. They believe that Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* has no attributes, and that His attributes are His Essence (*Dhāt*). Meaning Knowledge does not mean being Knowledgeable (*‘Ālim*), Power does not mean Powerful (*Qādir*), but he says Allah's attribute is His Essence, there are no attributes for Allah. *Astaghfirullāh al-‘Aẓīm*. A thing that is nothing. This is the danger in these people. Naturally scholars refuted them in detail on this.

I do not want to prolong upon you and exhaust you but I give you the most important principles of these *Mu‘tazilah*. And they are existing, inserted. I told you Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār, died 415 AH, has the book *Sharḥ al-Uṣūl al-Khamsah*, a printed book edited by Dr. ‘Abd al-Karīm ‘Uthmān. And he has the book *Faḍl al-I‘tizāl wa Ṭabaqāt al-Mu‘tazilah*, and his book is edited and printed.

We conclude here at the end of the *Mu‘tazilah*. The *Mu‘tazilah* naturally in the days of Caliph Al-Ma’mūn when they appeared and had power and a state, they entered the lands of the East and spread in the Islamic Maghreb. I told you some famous Mu'tazili scholars you know. And also there are famous Mu'tazilah among the most famous scholars especially in Baghdad: Bishr ibn al-Mu‘tamir, Thumāmah ibn al-Ashras, Abū Mūsā al-Murdār, and Ja‘far ibn Mubashshir. Abū Mūsā al-Murdār and Ja‘far ibn Mubashshir are the ones who declared Al-Naẓẓām and Abū Hudhayl al-‘Allāf disbelievers. And Ja‘far ibn Ḥarb, and Aḥmad ibn Abī Du’ād the famous Judge who died in 240 AH. Our Lord afflicted him with hemiplegia or paralysis and he died tormented and He humiliated him. Caliph Al-Mutawakkil took all his properties from him after that, as he did to the scholars. Our Lord *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* empowered Caliph Al-Mutawakkil over him, and Allah sickened him in his body, he became a soul in a box because he was afflicted with complete paralysis due to his fabrication and destruction of Islam and Muslims.

And these *Mu‘tazilah* after the death of Caliph Al-Ma’mūn as we told you, Al-Mu‘taṣim followed his path, then after that Caliph Al-Wāthiq. And after that this *I‘tizāl* in Basra, the *Mu‘tazilah* in Baghdad were influenced there. So they tested people and destroyed them and spread them in Transoxiana and other lands. But these appeared also when the issue of Creation of the Qur'an ended and they humiliated people. So when Caliph Al-Mutawakkil al-‘Abbāsī was pledged allegiance in 232 AH, he ended the

legend of the *Mu'tazilah* after that. And in the end, for the Sultan, some people appeared who took revenge on him. Revenge happened from them due to what they did. This happened in the days of the Great Sultan, a Sultan among the major Sultans, **Maḥmūd al-Ghaznawī** *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi*, he died in the year 421 AH. This is the conqueror of India anew and he dizzied the people of paganism. But paganism appeared again and scholars and sultans were lax with them. So this Sultan undertook a campaign to bury paganism, and liberated very many cities, and spread the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the region of Afghanistan and Transoxiana. All these regions, Sultan Maḥmūd al-Ghaznawī the famous, *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi*.

This man, had he lived longer, most of India would have returned now. It remained for ten centuries belonging to the State of Islam. India, all this belonged to Islam originally. What destroyed it was the laxity of Muslim scholars and laxity of Sultans. Naturally, the Tatars when they entered Islam and accepted Islam were diluted. They turned to Shiism at first, then after that came **Aurangzeb**[4], the best Sultans who entered Islam and became Sunnis. Until the British came and destroyed everything and ruined in the days of Sultan Aurangzeb who ruled more than fifty years these lands. But this Sultan undertook fighting the *Mu'tazilah*, imprisoned them and exiled them as they did to others, and forbade spreading this sect in that period, and clarified its danger and harm in lands there in India and Afghanistan and regions. But there were some people a century after him, **Al-Zamakhsharī** appeared, the famous author of *Al-Kashshāf*, he was a Mu'tazili and died in the year 538 AH.

But when this Inquisition (*Miḥnah*), Creation of the Qur'an, spread, some people fled and were influenced due to the meeting of Hajj seasons. People meet with each other. People went to North Africa in the Islamic Maghreb and in Tunisia this innovation appeared. But the Māliki scholars were among the most hostile people to the people of innovation. The old Māliki scholars frankly were better than current Māliki scholars. Māliki scholars were monotheists and these innovations were not in them. In the first centuries they were the ones who undertook the war on all these sects and fought the *Mu'tazilah* when they entered Tunisia at that time. And they are the ones who fought Banū 'Ubayd (Fatimids) and most scholars were killed, and they undertook numerous revolutions against Banū 'Ubayd. They are the Māliki scholars, and they have very severe and strong fatwas, *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhim*.

[4] Transcript says "Ramzi", likely referring to Aurangzeb or a similar figure, but context suggests Aurangzeb who ruled approx 50 years and was Sunni.

These scholars were very majestic in that period and fought the *Mu‘tazilah*. Then some *Mu‘tazilah* entered the Central Maghreb (Algeria) and sought protection with some tribes. So there was rapprochement between them and whom in the Central Maghreb? It was between them and the Rustamid State and the Ibāḍī State in that period. So they were influenced because there is intellectual and creedal twinning between the *Mu‘tazilah*, Ibāḍiyyah, and *Khawārij*. Therefore they were influenced there, they protected them in the Islamic Maghreb in the Central part which is Algeria. And they fled also there in the Idrisid State and lived there in tribes of Awraba and others which were professing this sect. The sect of *I‘tizāl* was in the Far Maghreb (Morocco), the brothers there at Marrakesh before the state of Ibn Tāshfīn. This was before the founding of the Murābiṭīn State.

In this period the ‘Ubaydiyyūn (Fatimids) appeared and eliminated all Māliki scholars and spread the sect of Shiism at that time. But in that period the *Mu‘tazilah* appeared actually in these lands and tried to find for themselves an incubator state. It embraced them only in Algeria, and the Idrisid State embraced them too, but they vanished with it.

In the East there was **Al-Ṣāḥib ibn ‘Abbād**, and he was a famous poet and litterateur. Naturally a short period then Al-Ṣāḥib ibn ‘Abbād ended. He was defending the *Mu‘tazilah*. And the legend of the *Mu‘tazilah* ended after that in history. Nothing remained except their ideas and nothing remained except their books and principles which caused what came after. Therefore I say those who opened the appetite of secularism and the appetite of attacking religion are the *Mu‘tazilah*. Because all those who tried to find anything to criticize in religion did not find except the *Mu‘tazilah*. Because the *Mu‘tazilah* specifically spoke about liberating the mind (*taḥrīr al-‘aql*), so people were infatuated with the mind and thought the mind is a judge over the Sharia. Therefore what wasted the *Mu‘tazilah* is that out of excessive liberation of the mind, which is essentially destruction of the mind, when you liberate the mind it is like speaking to an ant to carry a mountain; "O sister ant, carry the elephant!" How will the mind comprehend all this?

So the mind has its limits. These destroyed... look what they did. They were speaking about Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* with this boldness. They negated Power from Allah. After people enter Paradise and Hell etc., He cannot give life to a dead nor cause death to a living. Rather they described, as Al-Naẓẓām described: If a child or bird or animal was standing on the edge of Hell, Allah cannot order it to enter or not enter, He can only have power over Himself! Imagine! Meaning Allah cannot say to it enter or do not enter. Rather they, the *Mu‘tazilah*, said very strange things

mentioned by authors of sects, superstitions. Therefore I wish when we debate those who claim reason and glorify reason, that the sound mind does not contradict the Sharia. Otherwise look at Sūrah Al-Anʿām, to the Surahs of the Qur'an that speak even in the Meccan era; when discussing disbelievers it discusses them with the principle of what? Reason, observation, and deduction. It did not address disbelievers with Qur'anic verses in the sense of "believe in this" and "the thief's hand is cut." All this is in Medina. But most Meccan Qur'anic verses speak in rational argumentation, observation, and deduction.

Reason is the basis of legal responsibility (*manāṭ al-taklīf*) originally. The insane according to us, the Sharia does not burden him and he is not accountable before Allah, and Allah *Subḥānahu wa Taʿālā* pardons him. As for the factor of reason being the basis of responsibility that you pray, fast, know, and are held accountable, this is reason. But they opened reason and said what? They said entering Paradise... They said the son of the Messenger of Allah Ibrāhīm *ʿalayhis salām* and the children of believers have no preference nor degree nor superiority over scorpions, foxes, snakes, pigs, dogs, and insects. And all these will enter Paradise. By Allah, they believe this! Therefore Imam Al-Baghdādī ʿAbd al-Qāhir said to them: "We ask Allah *Subḥānahu wa Taʿālā* whoever believes in this opinion, pray with me: O Allah gather him with pigs, dogs, cats, snakes, and insects. Say Amen." He mocks them. The Mu'tazili says animals will enter Paradise. Poor things, why do they not enter Paradise?! Well, they are not burdened with anything. We believe they will be dust, their matter ends, and they are not punished. Is it reasonable he says to you the son of the Messenger of Allah Ibrāhīm and sons of Prophets are equal to pigs and insects in Paradise and that they enter with them?! *Aʿūdhu billāh*, what excess and deviation and extremism and disbeliefs is this!

These are the *Muʿtazilah* whom these secularists sanctify. And unfortunately some Sheikhs say to you: "The *Muʿtazilah*, yes we respect some opinions they say." You did not read the *Muʿtazilah* well and did not know the content of their quiver and did not know what they say. When he says to you "Tawhid and Justice," what does he mean by Justice? He means by Justice **negating Power from Allah**. He says to you "They believe in Justice!" They believe in the justice that is in their brains. They are the opposite of justice and equality which you mean. But the meaning of Justice for them is they negate the Power that Allah creates the actions of servants. *Aʿūdhu billāh*, is this what you believe in? And be deceived due to rhetoric and argumentation.

Naturally the *Muʿtazilah* were influenced by the books they translated from Greece and philosophy. They are the ones who introduced

this innovation to us. They are the ones who destroyed the creedal structure in the Islamic world; because by their translation of what is called "House of Wisdom" (*Dār al-Ḥikmah*) which Caliph Al-Ma’mūn established, this is its philosophy. The Islamic world before this *Fitnah* was sound in creed. This argumentation and these theories appeared to us... all these entirely due to this *Fitnah* which the *Mu‘tazilah* caused. Look at the danger of the *Mu‘tazilah*, more dangerous than the *Khawārij*. The *Khawārij* meaning are apparent, clear. He has specific principles you can detect easily. But the *Mu‘tazilah* have ideas and opinions, inserting and twisting in presenting the idea. They are of utmost danger due to their use of this reason.

This is what we were able to harp on today regarding the subject of the *Mu‘tazilah*. I hope I was able to convey the idea, by the grace of Allah.

As for the subject of the story of **Wāṣil ibn ‘Aṭā’** in the text of the sermon, so we do not return to him again. Wāṣil ibn ‘Aṭā’, this one was born in the year 80 AH. He had a lisp (*aldagh*) and has a famous sermon. Our professor the investigator Dr. ‘Abd al-Salām Hārūn *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi* had a book *Nawādir al-Makhṭūṭāt*, he published this sermon and Al-Mubarrad pointed to it in *Al-Kāmil* and others among authors of sects. He mentioned a long sermon and **did not mention the letter 'R' (*Rā’*) in it at all**. Meaning I challenge anyone speaking now not to mention the letter 'R' for the duration of for example five sentences, and see if you will mention the 'R' or not!

I will not read the complete sermon. Naturally it has some creedal errors, but I will read it as a text faithfully. He says: "Praise be to Allah the Ancient (*Al-Qadīm*) without limit and the Remaining (*Al-Bāqī*) without end. Who is High in His growth and Close in His highness. No time contains Him nor place encompasses Him. Nor does the preservation of what He created burden Him. And He did not create it upon a precedent example. I advise you, servants of Allah, along with myself, with the *Taqwa* of Allah and working in His obedience and avoiding His disobedience. So I urge you towards what brings you close to Him and advances you to Him. Indeed the *Taqwa* of Allah is the best provision and best outcome in which is a return. And let not the worldly life distract you with its decoration and deceptions and charms of its pleasures and desires of its hopes..." and much speech.

"Where are the Kings who built the cities and constructed the factories/fortresses and secured the doors and thickened the curtains and prepared the steeds and possessed the lands?" and much speech. "So take provision, may Allah heal you, for the best provision is *Taqwa*.

And fear Allah O people of understanding." Did you notice an 'R' here? There is no 'R' at all.

"I seek refuge in Allah the Strong from Satan the Misguided (*Al-Ghawī*)," he did not say *Al-Rajīm* (the Accursed) [because it has R], "Indeed Allah is the Hearing, the Knowing. In the name of Allah the Opener, the Bestower. (*Say, "He is Allah, [who is] One, Allah, the Eternal Refuge. He neither begets nor is born, Nor is there to Him any equivalent.*) [QS. Al-Ikhlāṣ]. May Allah benefit us and you with the Wise Book and with the Verses and the Clear Revelation (*Waḥy*), and protect us and you from the Painful Punishment, and admit us into Gardens of Bliss. And I say what I admonish you with and I seek the good pleasure of Allah for me and for you."

And it ended. Did you notice an 'R'? This is naturally a long sermon. Look at the alertness and intelligence. The people of innovation were intelligent. But the people of innovation in our days are of utmost stupidity and foolishness. They do not master speech nor language nor anything. They master illicit gain (*suḥt*) and theft and misleading and wiping beards and so on. But those were scholars, and eloquent, but they went astray in religion and deviated due to this creed. Therefore Wāṣil ibn 'Aṭā', we told you he died in the year 130 AH, and he is the cause of the *Fitnah* and the origin of the *Mu'tazilah*, and he is the one who set these principles and those who came after him adopted them.

We ask Allah the Great, Lord of the Great Throne, to encompass us in His mercy and teach us what benefits us.

I say this saying of mine and I seek forgiveness from Allah for me and for you..

Wa al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh..

The Sixth Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allah; we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allah from the evils of our souls and our bad deeds. Whomever Allah guides, there is no one to misguide him, and whomever He leads astray, there is no guide for him. I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, alone with no partner, and that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ تُقَاتِهِ وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُم مُّسْلِمُونَ

"O you who have believed, fear Allah as He should be feared and do not die except as Muslims." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 102]

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُم مِّن نَّفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا وَبَثَّ مِنْهُمَا رِجَالًا كَثِيرًا وَنِسَاءً ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا

"O mankind, fear your Lord, who created you from one soul and created from it its mate and dispersed from both of them many men and women. And fear Allah, through whom you ask one another, and the wombs. Indeed Allah is ever, over you, an Observer." [QS. An-Nisā’: 1]

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَقُولُوا قَوْلًا سَدِيدًا * يُصْلِحْ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ ۗ وَمَن يُطِعِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيمًا

"O you who have believed, fear Allah and speak words of appropriate justice. He will [then] amend for you your deeds and forgive you your sins. And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has certainly attained a great attainment." [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 70-71]

To proceed:

The most truthful speech is the Book of Allah, and the best guidance is the guidance of Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. And the worst of matters are their innovations, and every innovation is a heresy, and every heresy is a misguidance, and every misguidance is in the Fire.

Honored brothers, here we are on the twenty-third day of the month of Dhūl-Ḥijjah of the year 1432 AH. We are also with the **Sixth Lesson** of the Faith Course, and the lesson today will be about the **Ash'āriyyah**.

The Ash'āriyyah:

I was attempting to combine the *Ash'āriyyah* and *Māturīdiyyah* today, but because the *Ash'āriyyah* require sufficient and considerable time, I preferred that the discussion today, *in shā' Allāh*, be about the *Ash'āriyyah*. And in the Seventh Lesson, *in shā' Allāh*, we will speak about the relationship between the *Ash'āriyyah* and *Māturīdiyyah*, and speak about the *Māturīdiyyah* also with some non-deficient brevity; given that there is intellectual and creedal twinning. For the *Māturīdiyyah* is the sister of the *Ash'āriyyah*. If we speak about the *Ash'āriyyah*, it is as if you are speaking about the *Māturīdiyyah*, since the difference between them is in limited issues, especially in the issue of *Qadar*.

As for today, we will speak about the *Ash'āriyyah*. I have gathered about twenty points to speak about. First, I will speak a brief about the **Founder of the Ash'ari Madhhab** and to whom this *Madhhab* is attributed, who is **Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī**, we spoke about him before, who died in the year 324 AH. We will speak about the **Early Ash'aris** (*Mutaqaddimīn*) like Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī himself, and Al-Ṭabarī who is one of Al-Ash'arī's students (and the Ṭabarī intended here is the one who died in the year 380 AH, not Imam Al-Ṭabarī who is upon the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*, Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī who died in the year 310 AH, the author of the *Tafsir* and *History*; for this one is upon the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*). Also from the early ones is **Al-Bāqillānī** who died in the year 402 AH, and **Ibn Fūrak** who is among the major Imams of the *Ash'āriyyah* and died in the year 406 AH.

We will also speak about the difference between the **Early** and **Late** (*Muta'akhkhirīn*) *Ash'āriyyah*. And about the late ones like **Al-Rāzī** who died in the year 606 AH, and **Al-Āmidī** who died in the year 630 AH. And we speak about **Al-Ījī** who died in the year 756 AH, and was a contemporary of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah. And we speak about **Al-Subkī**, **Al-Shahrastānī**, **Al-Juwaynī**, and **Ibn 'Asākir**. These are the luminaries of the *Madhhab*. Among them are those attributed to *Ahl al-Ḥadīth* like Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn 'Asākir who died in the year 571 AH, and Imam **Al-Bayhaqī** and others.

We will point quickly to the phases through which Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī passed. I spoke about them in a previous lecture, and said he underwent three phases in his life. When he was a **Mu'tazili** until the age

of forty, and took *I‘tizāl* and learned it at the hands of his mother's husband Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār[5]. Then after that he moved to the **Kullābiyyah** and took it from Abū Muḥammad ibn Sa‘īd al-Kullābī[6]. Then after that he moved to **Independence**, which is a mixture of Kullābiyyah on some issues agreed upon with *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah*. So this became the *Ash‘āriyyah* about which he spoke, whether in his book *Al-Ibānah*, which did not appeal to the late Ash'aris, or the book *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn wa Ikhtilāf al-Muṣallīn*, in which he affirmed very many things agreeing with *Ahl al-Sunnah* in creedal issues.

We also speak about why Ibn Taymiyyah *raḥimahullāh* used to argue with the book of Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ‘Asākir when he was debating the *Ash‘āriyyah* in his time? The book is *Tabyīn Kadhib al-Muftarī*. Is there praise for the book in this?

We speak a brief about the most famous sayings of the scholars in their books like Al-Bāqillānī, Al-Juwaynī, Al-Āmidī, Al-Rāzī, and others. We speak about their cold justifications regarding the issue of prostrating to an idol, and Al-Rāzī's justification and detailing in this issue briefly. There is also a difference and contradiction between the late scholars and Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī himself in the issue of **Exception in Faith** (*Istithnā’*) and in the issue of **Highness** (*‘Uluw*) and other issues. There is also a doubt said about Ibn Fūrak and the reason for his killing by Sultan Maḥmūd ibn Subuktigīn; it was said he killed him in the year 406 AH, it was said because he said a heinous saying about the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. We will present this doubt, *in shā’ Allāh*.

There is also an issue we will speak about: **Were Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī and Al-Nawawī and these prominent scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah* truly Ash'aris?** And were they committed to the Ash'ari *Madhhab* truly? Some people accuse them of being Ash'aris; was this talk true?

It was known about their early ones that they affirm things in Names and Attributes; they speak of **Informative Attributes** (*Ṣifāt Khabariyyah*) and **Voluntary Attributes** (*Ṣifāt Ikhtiyāriyyah*)[7]. They affirm seven attributes, and interpret the rest of the attributes. What is the meaning of

---

[5] Likely refers to Abū ‘Alī al-Jubbā’ī, as 'Abd al-Jabbār came later.

[6] Ibn Kullāb died earlier, likely took from his followers.

[7] Early Ash'aris generally affirmed 7 rational attributes, and some affirmed Khabariyyah like Face/Hands without kayf, but typically denied Voluntary Actions/Sifat Fi'liyyah occurring in time. The text says "affirm Voluntary," likely meaning affirming attributes generally or referring to the 7 attributes they accepted.

Informative Attributes and Voluntary Attributes? And why did they differ in these issues? It is an important issue almost settled regarding the late ones in their creeds.

We also speak about one of the important issues, which relates to the Faith course: **Their restricting Faith to Heart Affirmation even if one did not utter the Shahādatayn**. We will speak about these issues and speak about Imam Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī, author of *Al-Iḥyā'* and *Al-Mustaṣfā* and others among the great Imams who are on the same creed. It was said he repented and returned, like Al-Juwaynī and others.

We will speak about a famous saying of theirs: "**The Madhhab of the Salaf is safer (*aslam*), and the Madhhab of the Khalaf (Successors) is wiser (*aḥkam*)**." We try to answer it, and clarify the falsity of this saying. Is this the saying of the late *Ash'āriyyah*? We will refute them, *in shā' Allāh*.

There is also the issue of the ruling on the *Ash'āriyyah*: **Are they disbelievers or Muslims? Are they upon the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*?** And why is it said that the *Ash'āriyyah* are *Ahl al-Sunnah*? We will refine this term. We speak in a very quick brief about famous ones among these scholars up to our present time, and contemporaries among them, the authors of books taught now like *Al-'Aqīdah al-Nasafiyyah*, and *Sharḥ Jawharat al-Tawḥīd*, explained by Sheikh Ibrāhīm al-Bājūrī who died in the year 1277 AH, which is *Tuḥfat al-Murīd fī Sharḥ Jawharat al-Tawḥīd*. And the book of Al-Sanūsī, author of *Manẓūmat Umm al-Barāhīn*, which is among the most important texts of the *Ash'āriyyah*; he is among the Māliki scholars and a great scholar.

And in a quick brief about the reason for the spread of the Ash'ari *Madhhab*, and who carried the banner of the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah* as it is said. We will comment on the issue of *Al-'Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* regarding Faith, *in shā' Allāh*, mentioned by Imam Abū Ja'far al-Ṭaḥāwī. Was Imam Abū Ja'far al-Ṭaḥāwī an Ash'ari? Because he was a contemporary of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī, so how did he become an Ash'ari?! He is a Ḥanafī and was upon the belief of Imam Abū Ḥanīfah in the famous view.

After that we speak, *in shā' Allāh*, about issues entering the subject of the *Māturīdiyyah*. These issues, the hour might not suffice them, so we complete them in the Seventh Lesson, but we will start with some as much as possible and accomplish the greatest amount possible.

Before we enter the subject, one of the youths sent me an issue for me to answer quickly; because he listened to a student of knowledge in the forums or Paltalk, and said that this youth is upon the creed of *Ahl al-*

Sunnah and is a good youth. Despite that, he said that the *Salaf* in their definition of Faith as: "**Speech, Action, and Intention**," that those who focused on "Intention" have a type of *Irjā'* in them. And that this brother was able to reach this understanding! So how do they say Faith is Speech, Action, and Intention, and intention meaning intent and heart affirmation, so this means they are *Murji'ah* in Faith?! May Allah reward the brother with good for his jealousy, but it is erroneous speech. It is not permissible to say it and take it lightly in this way. It is clear that the brother, may Allah bless him, did not refine the issue correctly, and did not think well even of the scholars of the *Salaf*, and these great Imams like Al-Ājurrī and before him Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī himself[8].

We must think well and know that they used to abbreviate expressions. Imam Al-Ājurrī, when he used to say: "Chapter: The saying that Faith is Affirmation by the Heart, Acknowledgment by the Tongue, and Action by the Limbs; one is not a believer unless these three qualities are combined in him," is it understood from this that Imam Al-Ājurrī was a *Murji'*?! And that he believes in heart affirmation only and does not believe the heart has action?! This is superficiality and simplification of issues and lack of good understanding.

Imam Al-Ājurrī in this era was among the most severe people against the *Murji'ah*. They are the ones who conveyed this knowledge to us and refuted the scholars of the *Murji'ah* especially in the beginning. Most scholars of the *Salaf* in the second and third centuries specifically were against the *Murji'ah* of the Jurists, who are lighter than the *Murji'ah* of Theologians (*Kalāmiyyah*) who appeared among the late ones later. Although they were of such severity... meaning for example Imam Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām, died in the year 224 AH, from the Successors of the Successors, and this is the Sheikh of Sheikhs; he has the book *Al-Īmān*. In it he defined Faith in this way, he said: "Know, may Allah have mercy on you, that the people of knowledge regarding this matter split into two sects; one of them said it is by sincerity of Faith in the hearts, testimony of tongues, and action of limbs. The other sect said: Rather Faith is by hearts and tongues; as for actions, they are merely piety (*taqwā*) and righteousness (*birr*) and not from Faith. If we look into the difference of the two sects, we would find the Book and Sunnah confirming the sect that made Faith: Intention, Speech, and Action all together." Is the Imam, according to the opinion of this brother, may Allah forgive him, a *Murji'*?!

He is the great *Ḥāfiẓ* and the Scholar of Scholars. Read the book of this man, you find him affirming that hearts have action, and mentioning

[8] Likely refers to other Salaf Imams.

verses. Most evidences taken by Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah were from Abū 'Ubayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām, and he took them from those before him, and Al-Ājurrī, and from Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Mandah and others.

All these scholars mentioned these issues but they were abbreviating the expression. Therefore I will not prolong on this issue. Please, let no one take liberty and rush to say the *Salaf* missed this issue, accusing the scholars that they defined Faith and mentioned the word "Intention", and some of them mentioned "Sunnah" too, meaning being upon the Sunnah. Because this indicates that these youths who read these books do not seek accuracy. Even Ibn Taymiyyah defended the *Salaf* and clarified the expressions that must be understood from the *Salaf* when they say "Affirmation by the Heart," intending affirmation in speech and action, not mere knowledge. But their expressions were brief.

Ibn Taymiyyah says in his book *Al-Īmān*: "From this chapter are the sayings of the *Salaf* and Imams of the Sunnah in the interpretation of Faith. Sometimes they say: It is speech and action. Sometimes they say: It is speech, action, and intention. Sometimes they say: It is speech, action, intention, and following the Sunnah. Sometimes they say: Speech by the tongue, belief by the heart, and action by the limbs." What does Ibn Taymiyyah say about these definitions combined? "And all this is correct. For whoever said: 'Faith is speech and action,' enters into 'speech' the speech of the heart and tongue together. This is the understood meaning; the term 'speech' (*qawl*) and 'speech' (*kalām*) and the like when used absolutely."

He also says: "The intention here is that the speech of the heart and tongue and the action of the heart and limbs is the concept according to the *Salaf*. Whoever added 'Belief' (*I'tiqād*) saw that the term 'Speech' might be understood as only apparent speech, or feared that, so added Belief. Whoever said 'Speech, Action, and Intention'; Speech covers Belief and speech of the tongue. As for Action, Intention might not be understood from it [explicitly], so he added that as a precaution. Whoever added 'Following the Sunnah', it is because all that is not beloved to Allah except by following the Sunnah."

These are precautions, O brother, among the *Salaf*, and good thinking of them. Those did not intend *every* speech and action, rather they intended the legislated sayings and actions. But their intent was refuting the *Murji'ah* who saw it as speech only. So they said: Rather it is speech and action. Those who made Faith four parts explained their intent. Just as Sahl ibn 'Abdullāh al-Tustarī was asked about Faith, what is it? He said: "**Speech, Action, Intention, and Sunnah**. Because Faith, if it is speech

without action, is disbelief. If it is speech and action without intention, it is hypocrisy. And if it is speech, action, and intention without Sunnah, it is innovation." This is the brief answer to this brother, may Allah bless him. Let him be cautious, careful, verify, and think well of the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in such issues. The cure for ignorance is questioning.

We begin with the subject of the Ash‘āriyyah. Who is the founder of the *Madhhab*?

He is **Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī**. It was said he was born in the year 260 AH, some said otherwise, and died in the year 324 AH (disputed, but this is famous). He lived in Basra and Baghdad in the days of the Abbasid Caliphate. He lived through six Caliphs, living until the caliphate of Abū al-‘Abbās Aḥmad al-Rāḍī Billāh who died in 329 AH. He witnessed divisions and the appearance of the **Zanj Rebellion** which appeared in 255 AH to 270 AH, I spoke about it and wrote a research on it.

And the appearance of the **Qarmatians** who appeared in the year 272 AH.

And the appearance of the malicious state, the **‘Ubaydī (Fatimid) State**, which appeared in the Islamic Maghreb at that time, 296 AH. Then they entered and occupied Egypt and sat in it for 200 years, two centuries and eight years, until Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī removed them. Ibn Ṭūlūn became independent with the rule of Egypt and Syria. These were unrests in the Islamic world.

This era also saw the fading of the star of the *Mu‘tazilah*. His mother's husband is Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār[9], who explained the Five Principles in a book and died in 415 AH[10]. We recounted the story of his exit from the *Mu‘tazilah*, saying: "I take off the garment of *I‘tizāl* as I take off this garment of mine." He discussed the issue of "The Salutary and the Most Salutary" (*Al-Ṣāliḥ wa al-Aṣlaḥ*) in which he debated his Sheikh. There are many issues and reasons mentioned by scholars.

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ‘Asākir mentioned in his book *Tabyīn Kadhib al-Muftarī* a large comprehensive biography of Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī, his books, opinions, and scholars' praise for him. He has many

[9] Historical accuracy check: Al-Ash'ari's stepfather was Abu Ali al-Jubba'i, not Qadi 'Abd al-Jabbar who came later. The text says 'Abd al-Jabbar, possibly a slip of the tongue or transcription error, likely meant **Abū ‘Alī al-Jubbā’ī.**

[10] 'Abd al-Jabbar died 415 AH, al-Ash'ari died 324 AH. This confirms confusion in text between the stepfather and the later Qadi. Al-Jubba'i died 303 AH.

biographies in the books of late Ash'aris like *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah al-Kubrā* by Al-Subkī who died in 771 AH.

Naturally, the Ash'aris glorify him greatly in their books and attack his book *Al-Ibānah* because it contains an apparent return to the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*, even if not refined with precision. Generally, he returned to the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah* and it is among the last of what he wrote. But there remain some differences like his opinions in the definition of Faith; he has *Jahmiyyah* views in these issues and was not liberated absolutely, in some issues even from the *Mu'tazilah* and others. But in general, in his book *Al-Ibānah*, he is closer to *Ahl al-Sunnah*. Therefore, he has many opinions contradicting the late Ash'ari scholars.

Here the questioner might ask: What is the difference between late and early scholars, or between Al-Ash'arī himself and other Ash'aris? We alert that among the Ash'aris are those who might be identical to *Ahl al-Sunnah* in general. But we speak about the common and majority among the Ash'ariyya or what is almost settled among them. Some might disagree in issues even with scholars of their school, but he is not opposing Ash'arism as a general belief.

The phases through which Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī passed:

We said he was a Mu'tazili until the age of forty, a long period. Therefore in his book *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, when he spoke about the *Mu'tazilah*, he became a primary reference for the *Mu'tazilah*. When he left them, he attacked them and defeated their doubts and became an expert on them; because he lived in the lap of one of their luminaries, and debated with them and attended their debates until the age of forty. After that he turned to the *Madhhab* of Ibn Kullāb, which is closer to *Ahl al-Sunnah* but still contains things of innovations and so on. But they were closer to him and were attacking the *Mu'tazilah*. Then after that he dealt with some scholars of Hadith, so he inclined to the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the end of his life, but did not rid himself completely as we told you.

There are books and studies that spoke about him. For example, Ibn Taymiyyah is among the best who spoke about the *Ash'āriyyah*, and refined their *Madhhab* and the *Madhhab* of the *Jahmiyyah* and *Qadariyyah*. He came in his book *Dar' Ta'āruḍ al-'Aql wa al-Naql*, a large huge book in about 19 volumes depending on the print, with marvelous speech where he refuted doubts. He spoke on very difficult things for the beginning student of knowledge because he spoke on theological (*Kalāmiyyah*) issues and Attributes. It is not for the beginner to start with it, because he does not

have tools to understand these issues; he might start the first 20 pages then cannot continue. He was debating them with their logic, with the logic of logicians and philosophy, and it requires very great patience. Also in his Fatwas and his book *Al-Īmān*, whether *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* or *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ*, and in his writings in *Ijtimā‘ al-Juyūsh al-Islāmiyyah*[11] and his refutation of the *Jahmiyyah*, and his refutation of the *Ash‘āriyyah* ancient and modern. He was the bearer of the banner of the late ones in refuting the *Ash‘āriyyah*, and he is the one who was able to refine the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf*.

There are modern studies. Among the best is: *Mawqif Ibn Taymiyyah min al-Ashā‘irah* by Dr. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Maḥmūd. A very valuable thesis for whoever wants to understand Ibn Taymiyyah's opinion and the position of the *Salaf* in reality, and why the *Ash‘āriyyah* show hostility to him in this way. All this requires patience and deliberateness so a person understands such issues.

All this you will find refined in the books of the late ones a lot; because this sect is among the largest Islamic sects, and they say about themselves that they are *Ahl al-Sunnah*!

But what concerns us here is that Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī agreed with the *Kullābiyyah* in reality in many things, but he returned in his last book. The Ash'aris attacked him for it, like Al-Subkī and others and even the late ones today. Why? Because he affirmed the attribute of **Highness** (*‘Uluw*); meaning the Most Merciful rose over the Throne (*Istawā*), without *how* (*kayf*). This is the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. But they negate and interpret the attribute of Highness and say *Istawā* means *Istawlā* (conquered/dominated), meaning subdued. This is the mainstay of the late ones' speech. But Al-Ash‘arī differs from them, he affirms this attribute like *Ahl al-Sunnah* without *how*.

The great **Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ‘Asākir** was an Ash'ari, but he was against the theologians (*Mutakallimīn*) who were closer to philosophy like Al-Rāzī and others in issues of *Kalām* specifically. He is from the scholars of Hadith, so he was a great *Muḥaddith* but had Ash'ari creed. Therefore, there is talk between him and Imam **Ibn Qudāmah**, the scholar, *Ḥāfiẓ*, *Mujtahid*, great Ḥanbalī. If he saw Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ‘Asākir, he would not return the greeting. When asked: Why? He said: "He says the Speech of Allah is internal/psychological (*Nafsī*), intending the Qur'an, so I will return [the greeting] to him internally (*fī nafsī*) until he returns to the belief of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in this issue." He was rebuking him, not declaring him a

[11] Likely refers to Ibn al-Qayyim's book or Ibn Taymiyyah's general efforts.

disbeliever. This is an issue mentioned by some historians. I will explain it later.

In the book *Tabyīn Kadhib al-Muftarī*, Imam Ibn Taymiyyah debates the *Ash'āriyyah*. When he was debating them in his time, they used to mention the issue of Highness, negating it and interpreting it, citing the poetry of Al-Akhṭal: *Bishr conquered (istawā) Iraq... Without a sword or shed blood.*

Ibn Taymiyyah replied to them: Do you revere Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ʻAsākir? They said: Yes, he is our Sheikh. He said: Indeed Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʻarī —and they take pride in him and place him like the Companions— affirmed in his book *Al-Ibānah* the attribute of *Istiwā'* without *how*, and this is the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. They said: It is a book forged against him! He said: Your Sheikh Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ʻAsākir in his book *Tabyīn Kadhib al-Muftarī* argued with the book *Al-Ibānah* and affirmed Highness and Informative Attributes, and defended the creed of Imam Abū al-Ḥasan that he was on the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. But the contemporaries of Ibn Taymiyyah were very extreme.

The Difference between Early and Late Ash'aris:

The **Early ones** like Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʻarī affirm attributes and issues with *Ahl al-Sunnah*, like attributes of Highness, or Informative Attributes: attributes like Face, Two Hands, Two Eyes for Allah as befits His Majesty without *how*. (*There is nothing like unto Him, and He is the Hearing, the Seeing*). He agrees with the *Kullābiyyah* in these issues.

But **Al-Juwaynī**[12] for example said regarding the attribute of Hand (*The Hand of Allah is over their hands*), (*What prevented you from prostrating to what I created with My Two Hands*). He says: The Hand here means Power (*Qudrah*) or is a metaphor for it. These are interpretations of Ash'aris even current ones. Naturally this contradicts the text. Even if you interpret, by Allah, when Allah the Exalted says: (*Nay, both His Hands are extended*) [QS. Al-Mā'idah: 64], meaning His two powers?! This is false speech naturally. Rather Two Hands befitting His Majesty and we do not know the modality (*kayfiyyah*), there is nothing like Him and He is the Hearing, the Seeing. This is the belief of *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

Al-Ashʻarī affirmed the attribute of Highness in his book *Al-Ibānah*. Thus, the speech of the first differs from the speech of the late one

[12] Text says Al-Ājurrī here, but context implies an Ash'ari figure like Al-Juwaynī or similar who interprets. Al-Ājurrī is Hanbali Sunni. Likely text error for a late Ash'ari.

like **Al-Ījī** and **Zāhid al-Kawtharī** and others. And Al-Subkī the late one (Tāj al-Dīn). As for the early one, it is Taqī al-Dīn the Judge (his father). Subk is a village in Menoufia in Egypt, he is from there. He is a great Shāfi'ī judge, wrote *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah*, but died young[13]. His father is considered among the renewers in the Shāfi'ī school and on Ash'ari creed. His son specifically is among the extremists, although he studied under Al-Ḥāfiẓ Al-Dhahabī and praised him, yet he used to attack him due to Al-Dhahabī's inclination to the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. He is the author of *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'*. Although the *Ḥāfiẓ* was Shāfi'ī[14], he revered Ibn Taymiyyah and loved him and defended him and is counted as a student of his, like Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr and Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī then Ibn 'Abd al-Hādī and *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāẓ* and others.

We are speaking on the issue of Faith and it is a limited issue, but I give you a quick overview for increase, benefit, and good.

We summarize now the most important creeds of the Late Ash'aris specifically:

First: The late ones assumed very strange assumptions. They believed that **Reason (*'Aql*) might contradict Revelation (*Naql*)**. So they said if they conflict, Reason is the basis of responsibility, and it is what proved later that this religion is true and this is a Prophet of Allah and this is the Qur'an. So they were even influenced by the *Mu'tazilah* against whom Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī and others stood. These are among important issues for the *Mu'tazilah*. So they assumed a false assumption; that Reason testifies that the Qur'an is truth and the Messenger is truth. So if Reason and Revelation conflict, assuming their speech, we prioritize Revelation because Reason proved [it]. If your mind did not understand an issue, we prioritize Revelation because it is correct[15].

Among the late ones, many confusions occurred in such issues. Maybe I will point to them when we speak about **Rational Improvement and Detriment** (*Al-Taḥsīn wa al-Taqbīḥ al-'Aqlī*) when we speak about

---

[13] Taqī al-Dīn lived long, Tāj al-Dīn lived till 40s.

[14] Al-Dhahabī was Shāfi'ī in Fiqh but often associated with Hanbali creed/Ibn Taymiyyah. Text says Ḥanbalī, but Dhahabī is historically Shāfi'ī.

[15] Text seems contradictory or explaining the Sunni response. Ash'aris typically prioritize Reason in case of conflict (via Ta'wil). The speaker might be clarifying the correct stance or explaining their twisted logic. Usually they say: Prioritize Reason (metaphorical interpretation) because Reason validated the text.

the *Māturīdiyyah* and the difference between it and *Ash'āriyyah* in these issues in the coming lecture.

Even some late ones among them like **Al-Ṭahṭāwī** and others; once he patches Reason and Revelation, once he prioritizes Reason over Revelation. I refuted this and mentioned it in my book *Dawr Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī fī Takhrīb al-Huwwiyyah al-Islāmiyyah* (The Role of Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī in Destroying Islamic Identity). He is an Ash'ari scholar who went to France, was infatuated with it, and returned after five years. He is the first layer of secularist bricks in the entire Islamic world! He was confused in his beginning with Ash'arism; he was trying to reconcile Reason and Revelation, so sometimes affirms Reason, sometimes affirms Revelation, sometimes affirms Improvement.

From the issues also settled among late Ash'aris: **Negating Voluntary Attributes** (*Ṣifāt Ikhtiyāriyyah*) that subsist in the Essence of Allah. There are Informative Attributes like Face and Eyes etc., and Voluntary Attributes like *Istiwā'* (Rising) and Descent (*Nuzūl*) of Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* in the last third every day saying: "Is there any seeker of forgiveness that I may forgive him, is there any asker that I may give him," until the dawn call. But they negated this.

I remember it was said to one of the scholars, Isḥāq ibn Rāhwayh: "How do you speak regarding these Hadiths like Descent and Rising? Those who transmitted the rulings to us are the ones who transmitted this to us. So how do you accept this and reject that?!" He said to him: "Does He descend and leave His Throne?!" So he said to him by way of binding argument: "**Is He able to descend or not?**" So he was dumbfounded. Because if he said He is not able, he has disbelieved, because he negated Power from Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*. And if he said He is able, he is bound to say He descends as befits His Majesty. Here he was dumbfounded! Therefore, no one debates these except stallions and people of knowledge.

You find them interpreting **Coming** (*And your Lord has come*) [QS. Al-Fajr: 22], and the attribute of **Speech**, saying: Speech is internal (*Nafsī*). Also **Pleasure** (*Riḍā*) and **Anger** (*Ghaḍab*), interpreting them as something of metaphor, meaning blessing in Paradise or punishment. So they negated Voluntary Attributes from the Essence of Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*. From the principles among the late ones is that they affirmed **Seven Attributes**: Life, Knowledge, Power, Will, Hearing, Sight, Internal Speech. Why did you affirm this and negate Voluntary Attributes?!

They said: Because these attributes resemble creatures, as if there is a limb like the creature. But these seven attributes [also] resemble

attributes of creatures, so why did you not affirm them [all] as the *Salaf* affirmed as befits His Majesty?!

The rest of attributes they affirm by **Interpretation** (*Ta'wīl*) or **Delegation** (*Tafwīḍ*). Example of Mercy (*Raḥmah*): Recompense and Will of Reward. Delegation is less dangerous than Interpretation. He affirms it but delegates the knowledge to Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*. Example: (*The Most Merciful rose over the Throne*). He affirms it as a verse but its knowledge is with Allah. But the Arabs knew the word *Istawā* meaning Rose and Ascended. The Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* was teaching us without complications. If you are fleeing from likeness (*Tashbīh*), if *Istawā* means *Istawlā* (conquered), was there a partner disputing with Him, *Subḥānahu*?!

Another important issue, related to the Faith course: **Their restricting Faith to Heart Affirmation even if one did not utter the Shahādatayn**. If we return to some of their scholars like Al-Juwaynī and Al-Rāzī and others, they also affirm that. I will read you some of these sayings.

For example, Al-Juwaynī says: "The accepted view according to us is that its reality, Faith, is Affirmation of Allah the Exalted. So the believer in Allah is he who affirmed Him. Then Affirmation upon verification is the speech of the soul (*Kalām al-Nafs*)." This is exactly the *Jahmiyyah*, Affirmation only. Even **Tawhid** for them; the meaning of *Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*. The known meaning of *Ilāh* is: The Worshipped (*Ma'būd*). As for them: It is **The Creator Capable of Innovation and Invention**. This is the speech of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī himself. Naturally, Ibn Taymiyyah and Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr discussed them in these issues a lot. The witness here is even the major word of Tawhid, their understanding of it is other than the understanding of the *Salaf*. Therefore you find Ash'aris in their books affirming Creation and Invention, but where is Action! They expelled Action from Faith fundamentally.

And the **First Obligation** upon the responsible person (*Mukallaf*) [according to Sunnis] is to know: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*). As for them, they say the first obligation upon the responsible person is **Rational Deduction** (*Istidlāl 'Aqlī*), meaning using his mind. If he does not do it, he has not entered the fold of Faith! This is naturally contrary to the *Salaf*, rather contrary to the Qur'an and authentic Hadiths. Therefore, the Hadiths speaking on these issues, they interpret them.

Al-Bāqillānī said the same speech, as we mentioned, and inferred with linguists, and we refuted him before. They are *Jahmiyyah* in the issue of Faith. The early ones like Al-Bāqillānī and late ones like Al-Juwaynī say that. And Al-Āmidī who carried the banner after Al-Rāzī. Al-Rāzī is among their seniors and theologians, he says textually: "Thus appears the corruption of the saying of the **Ḥashawiyyah** —*Ahl al-Sunnah*— that Faith is Affirmation by the heart, Acknowledgment by the tongue, and Action by the pillars." He considers this speech false. Faith for them is Affirmation only. Even in the explanation of *Jawharat al-Tawḥīd*: *"And interpret Faith as Affirmation... And regarding Pronouncement, there is disagreement upon verification." Jawharat al-Tawḥīd* is among those generalized and taught and has many explanations. He says in the text: "Interpret Faith as Affirmation"; meaning Faith is Affirmation only.

Even the speech of Al-Juwaynī... Scholars said Al-Juwaynī was in the end of his life upon the creed of the *Salaf* and died upon it, saying: "Here I am dying upon the creed of the old women of Nishapur." He is a pillar among pillars of the *Ash'āriyyah*, author of *Al-Ghiyāthī* and others. It was said to him: "You affirm Faith for a man drowning in *Fisq* (immorality) like the Faith of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*?!" He replied a cold reply, saying: "The difference in Faith between the *Fāsiq* and the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*..." so he affirmed types of affirmation for the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* he did not affirm for others. Naturally this is false speech. All this is so they do not affirm action of the heart, nor affirm action of the limbs.

Even regarding the subject of **Speech** (*Qawl*), they do not care about it. Those who cared about it, some of them tried to affirm Acknowledgment by Speech like Ibn Abī al-'Izz al-Ḥanafī and before him Al-Ṭaḥāwī. These are Imams of their Imams[16]. Even Al-Āmidī's speech is the same way. This saying implies the faith of **Iblīs** and **Pharaoh** and Jews and Christians! Because Jews, Christians, and Iblīs knew Allah, so they are affirmers. They said: Allah said about them polytheists and disbelievers because He looked into their hearts that they are polytheists and disbelievers. Naturally, confusion in this matter.

Ibn Taymiyyah refuted them and said this corrupt principle in their saying that **Prostrating to an idol**, wearing the cross and belt (*zunnār*), killing the Prophet, insulting the Noble *Muṣḥaf* and Ka'bah and the like **is not disbelief**, rather it is **evidence of disbelief** which is the negation of Affirmation in the heart of its doer. This is Al-Rāzī's justification, and it is a cold justification. "This indicates that a believer does not do that." We

[16] Ṭaḥāwī is Hanafi/Murji'ah of Jurists, not Ash'ari.

say: He who does that in word and deed, outwardly and inwardly, is [committing] disbelief, not evidence of disbelief. Therefore you will find among contemporary Ash'aris, and those attributing themselves to Salafism now and worshippers of rulers... these say: "Even if he wore the cross, even if he insulted the *Muṣḥaf*, O brother did you open his heart?"

Rather we say: O brother, this person urinated on the *Muṣḥaf* and we know he is so-and-so, and he knows it is a *Muṣḥaf* and is not non-Arab. Another wore the cross knowing it is a cross. Another prostrated to an idol, and this is worship having no solution other than being worship. He says: "It is evidence of disbelief." Rather **he himself is a disbeliever**. Therefore people err in an issue: that he committed *Kufr*, so we say this is an act of *Kufr* and he is thus a *Kāfir*. If he goes to the judge, he seeks details from him and asks him to repent; perhaps he is insane and there is no responsibility here. But is this *Kufr*? Yes. Is he a *Kāfir*? Yes. But upon applying the ruling of *Kufr*, the judge seeks details. If he was insane, there is no ruling on him. But the act is *Kufr*.

Therefore, according to them, *Kufr* is in Belief only not Action, so they have no **Disbelieving Action**. This is Al-Rāzī's speech. "Reality of *Kufr* is internal things known only to Allah." So it is confusion for them. Running rulings on their appearance in this world, and issues of disbelieving things inside, in the inward, running worldly rulings ran on the world. Assuming a human repented within himself, this is with Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā*. We run rulings upon him in this world.

There is a **Disbelieving Saying** and **Disbelieving Act**. Insulting the Lord, insulting the Messenger, prostrating to an idol or worshipped object: a calf, a cow, a sacred thing, or urinating on the *Muṣḥaf*. They said it is evidence of *Kufr*. We say: This saying or act **is Kufr**, and this person is a disbeliever outwardly and inwardly.

The rulers produced for us these Neo-Madkhalis and Jāmis and some major Salafi Sheikhs spreading in the world now to entrench the issue that *Kufr* is *Kufr* of Belief only, and there is no Practical *Kufr*, it is "*Kufr* less than *Kufr*." This is false speech by the words of the *Salaf*. We will refute these doubts in a coming lesson, *in shā' Allāh*.

The **Early Ash'aris** like Imam Abū al-Ḥasan inclined to the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the issue of believing in Highness, and permissibility of **Exception in Faith** (*Istithnā'*), meaning: "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*." But the Late ones like Al-Nasafī and others say: It is not correct to say "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*." They say it is not proper, because they restrict Faith to Heart Belief, so how can he say "*in shā' Allāh*"? He is doubting!

This is erroneous speech. Imam Aḥmad and Ibn Mas'ūd said: It is permissible to say "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*" and not to say it. If I said this, it means: The many Sharia obligations, I am not certain I perform them all. As for the heart meaning, I am a believer and affirmer, so we do not say "*in shā' Allāh*." But if we intended Actions, who among us can perform all Sharia obligations and guarantee their acceptance?! Even the early Ash'aris, their justification differs from the justification of the *Salaf*. We will talk about it later so there is no defect, *in shā' Allāh*.

Among the most famous scholars who established and anchored the school: **Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ṭabarī** (d. 380 AH), and **Al-Bāqillānī** who developed and renewed the school (403 AH), he is the Professor and Second Founder. And the erudite scholar among them **Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Fūrak** (d. 406 AH). It was said Sultan Maḥmūd ibn Subuktigīn killed him. When he was asked: "Is the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* still a Prophet?" He said: "The Prophet died, and his message ended and he is not a Prophet now." So he ordered his imprisonment, and it was said they poisoned him. Al-Subkī was among the extremists so he defended Ibn Fūrak. Ibn Fūrak was among the fanatics too although he was close in time to Al-Ash'arī. He has a biography in *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'*. Al-Dhahabī said about him: "The Imam, the Erudite, the Righteous, Sheikh of Theologians, Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn Fūrak al-Aṣbahānī." His student is Imam **Al-Bayhaqī**, famous author of *A'lām al-Nubuwwah*. But unfortunately he inclines in some interpretation of Attributes although he is a *Ḥāfiẓ* and *Muḥaddith* of high status. And **Al-Qushayrī** is among his students. He was a debater and knowledgeable in the art of *Kalām*.

Ibn Ḥazm mentioned in *Al-Fiṣal* the issue that Ibn Fūrak said: "The Messenger of Allah was... and the soul of the Messenger of Allah has become void and vanished and is not in Paradise." So he angered the Sultan due to these false interpretations. Naturally Al-Subkī in *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah* tried to launch an attack on Ibn Ḥazm and tried to deny what is said about Ibn Fūrak and that this is falsehood. Ibn Ḥazm took it from Abū al-Walīd al-Bājī who is an Ash'ari Imam. So Ibn Ḥazm transmitted it. So why blame Ibn Ḥazm? And Al-Dhahabī?! Because naturally it is speech of utmost danger. Especially the late ones tried to negate and attacked the narration. This is what happened due to excessive interpretations and ramifications of the Ash'aris.

The issue of the Ash'aris' saying: "**The Madhhab of the Salaf is safer (*aslam*), and the Madhhab of the Khalaf is more knowledgeable (*a'lam*) and wiser (*aḥkam*)**," in the issue of Attributes and Interpretation and the issue of Creation of the Qur'an.

Naturally we believe the Qur'an is the Speech of Allah uncreated, which is the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. Even those among them who say it is uncreated say it is **Internal Speech** (*Kalām Nafsī*), and there is no speech issued from Allah basically. That Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* created creation and left it like this running automatically. What do you say about His saying: (*Every day He is in a matter*) [QS. Al-Raḥmān: 29], and ("Allah raises peoples and lowers others")? It is a renewed Will. They negate that unfortunately and interpret it with false interpretations. And they tried to fabricate it with what insults the *Salaf*. For example, Voluntary Attributes like Descent and Pleasure. They said the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* is safer, they pass them as they came. But the *Khalaf* are wiser and more knowledgeable!

Rather you are more confused and contradictory, spreading innovations and emboldening people to sins. This phrase exists in many late Ash'aris, and some Islamic groups say it! Do you accuse the Companions and Successors and Successors of Successors up to the third century approximately, who carried the religion and conveyed it, the pure centuries?!

You must, when you hear it, invalidate it and say: **Rather the Methodology of the Salaf is Safer, More Knowledgeable, and Wiser.** Would that the *Khalaf* followed the *Salaf*!

We start after that in issues we say next week by Allah's permission; **Are they Muslims? Or Disbelievers? Are they on the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah*?** We say it generally and detail it in the next lesson.

The *Ash‘āriyyah* in general, *Ahl al-Sunnah* did not declare them disbelievers and considered them among the Interpreters (*Muta’awwilīn*). And *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the **General Sense**, those who are against Shiites and *Khawārij*, then yes. They are against Shiites and express pleasure with Companions and agree with *Ahl al-Sunnah* in many things. They stood up and undertook defense in a certain period. Scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah* were silent about them at that time, so people thought they were the people of correct creed, due to the absence of scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. The *Ash‘āriyyah* were busy refuting the *Rāfiḍah*, *Mu‘tazilah*, *Khawārij*, Christians, and Jews. So *Ahl al-Sunnah* were silent about them considering they defend Islam. So the *Ash‘āriyyah* presented themselves as *Ahl al-Sunnah* and owners of the correct creed and that this is the creed of the Companions.

So they are *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the **General Concept**, but they are not upon the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the **Specific Concept**. They are not so

in issues of Faith, in simple issues even like *Khabar al-Wāḥid* (Single Report), they have opinions differing from the famous view of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. And the Chapter of Attributes as we mentioned. So they are not on the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the creedal concept. As for the general concept, yes. They used to prioritize Abū Bakr, ʻUmar, ʻUthmān, and ʻAlī, believe in the Unseen, defend Lady ʻĀ'ishah, fight disbelievers and extremist people of innovation, and denounce people's immorality. They have good stances.

Ibn Taymiyyah and *Ahl al-Sunnah* were fair to them. But as a creedal concept, they are not upon it. They did not declare them disbelievers because they were interpreting. Scholars regarding issues of interpretation have special conditions. If we withdrew the issue of Takfir [to them], you would declare very very big names disbelievers. The issue is not an issue of emotion. But scholars defended them, that they were interpreting (*yata'awwalūn*) and erred in some concepts and had interpretations they relied upon. Interpretation is not absolute; there are issues where interpretation is not valid. Example His saying: (*That you slaughter a cow*) [QS. Al-Baqarah: 67]. The *Rāfiḍah* interpreted it as Lady ʻĀ'ishah *raḍiyallāhu ʻanhā*! *Aʻūdhu billāh*. This interpretation is fundamentally not accepted linguistically, nor in understanding, nor textually.

Ibn al-Qayyim has beautiful speech on breaking the Idol of Interpretation (*Ṭāghūt al-Ta'wīl*) in *Al-Ṣawāʻiq al-Mursalah* and others. And the erudite **ʻAbd al-Raḥmān al-Muʻallimī** *raḥmatullāhi ʻalayhi*, you could describe him as the Al-Dhahabī of our era (*raḥmatullāhi ʻalayhi*), has a book *Fī Ḥaqīqat al-Ta'wīl* and has very beautiful speech. There are Master's and PhD theses on Acceptable Interpretation and others, and treatises of Ibn Taymiyyah and the difference between Interpretation, Metaphor, and Exegesis. Who derived it from the book of Ibn Taymiyyah and Al-Qayyim and who derived it from the Book and Sunnah.

We suffice with this amount. *In shā' Allāh* we stop at the ruling of the *Ashʻāriyyah* and speak next time about the *Māturīdiyyah* and its relationship to the *Ashʻāriyyah*. But before that, about the most famous Ash'ari scholars and doubts said, that Imam Ibn Ḥajar al-ʻAsqalānī and Imam Al-Nawawī and others are Ash'ari scholars. And I answer the issue of **Why the Ash'ari Madhhab Spread**. You find no country of the Islamic world and all Fiqh schools, even the Ḥanbalī school which was fortified, we find some scholars influenced by Ash'ari scholars. Why did all this spread? This is what I try to answer in the next lesson, *in shā' Allāh*.

I say this saying of mine, and I seek forgiveness from Allah for me and for you.

May Allah bless you and reward you with all good..

Wa al-salāmu ‘alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh..

The Seventh Lesson

Verily, all praise is due to Allah; we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allah from the evils of our souls and our bad deeds. Whomever Allah guides, there is no one to misguide him, and whomever He leads astray, there is no guide for him. I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, alone with no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed:

Honored brothers; here we are on the first day of the month of Muḥarram of the year 1433 of the blessed Prophetic Hijrah. A Hijri year has passed; we ask Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* to forgive us and to accept our righteous deeds from us. We are also today with the **Seventh Lesson** of the lessons of the course on Issues Regarding Faith (*Masā'il fī al-Īmān*). Today, *in shā' Allāh*, our lesson will be about the **Māturīdiyyah** and their relationship with the **Ash'āriyyah**.

The Māturīdiyyah:

In the beginning, after welcoming you and *al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh*, I would like to clarify the plan of this lecture about the *Māturīdiyyah*.

First, today, *in shā' Allāh*, we will speak about the **Founder of the Māturīdiyyah** and about the **Relationship of these Māturīdiyyah with the Ash'āriyyah**. We speak about the founder who is **Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī**; who is he, when was he born, when did he die, and his scholarly works. Also, we speak about some of the most important famous scholars of the *Māturīdiyyah* in the Islamic world. As I told you previously, the *Māturīdiyyah* are the sisters of the *Ash'āriyyah*; meaning you can hardly distinguish between them. You will find the matter is extremely difficult except in specific issues between the *Māturīdiyyah* and the *Ash'āriyyah*. This is what we will harp on, *in shā' Allāh*, in this lecture.

Thus, there are also issues related to the previous lecture about the *Ash'āriyyah*, and I had presented about twenty issues to you in this matter. Some issues remained, such as the issue of **Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī** and **Imam Al-Nawawī**: Are they Ash'aris or not? This, *in shā' Allāh*, we will answer.

We also spoke about the **Reasons for the Spread of the Ash'āriyyah and Māturīdiyyah** around the Islamic world, so much so that the reader or contemplator in the Islamic world or through the books of these people [hears] them saying that they represent *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and

that they are *Ahl al-Sunnah*. So what is the reality of this claim? We also speak about an issue I wanted to talk about but I will postpone it, *in shā' Allāh*, to another lecture regarding **Exception (*Istithnā'*) in Faith**, and Does Faith Increase and Decrease? This is the issue of the **Murji'ah of the Jurists** (*Murji'at al-Fuqahā'*), and was Imam Abū Ḥanīfah a *Murji'*? Is he from the *Murji'ah* of the Jurists? What is the correct opinion regarding the creed of Imam Abū Ḥanīfah in the issue of Faith? We also speak about some **Books against which we warn**, which are printed books available currently; I will try to point to such points.

One of the youths asked me wanting to know a specific book to follow me in. I will answer this, and I said it in the first lecture and I repeat: I mention several books. I mentioned the two books of Imam Ibn Taymiyyah (*Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ* and *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr*), and I mentioned the book *Al-Sharī‘ah* by Imam Al-Ājurrī if you want to follow me. In the book *Al-Īmān* by Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām and Ibn Baṭṭah... more than ten books. These are books from which I try to summarize and condense to make it easy for you, O brother, O youth loving your religion and trying to learn. I try to condense from more than ten or fifteen books sometimes in order to reach a piece of information to present to you easily. They are merely keys to these sciences and these books, so return to them.

But what concerns me here when I speak in mentioning the *Māturīdiyyah* and *Ash‘āriyyah* is their relationship to the issue of the course. This course is for talking about their relationship regarding the issue of **Faith**. If I wished to speak about the *Ash‘āriyyah*, they would need a complete course of 50 or 60 lessons for example because they have very many things, books, and references I will point to later, *in shā' Allāh*.

The **Ash‘āriyyah** and **Māturīdiyyah**, what is famous about them in their books, ancient and modern, is that they are **Jahmiyyah in the definition of Faith**. They define Faith as **Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*) only**, and relied on the meaning of Faith in the linguistic sense only. Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah refuted this doubt, and the scholars of Sunnah before him refuted it, like Al-Ājurrī, Qāḍī Abū Ya‘lā, and Ibn Baṭṭah. All these scholars refuted these doubts in the past. And Imam Aḥmad naturally rejected them and rebuked them, and rebuked even Ibn Kullāb and rebuked those who appeared in his time, and used to give fatwa not to sit with them.

So the witness here is that the *Ash‘āriyyah* and *Māturīdiyyah* are united in the issue of Faith. They are **Jahmiyyah** in the definition of Faith and rely on the definition of the heart only. Meaning Faith is Knowledge or Heart Affirmation only. They expel actions of the hearts and actions of the limbs from the issue of Faith. Meaning one believed and testified that

there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah with his heart by knowledge without even the tongue, they expel even the tongue, if he dies upon that, he is a believer with complete faith according to them.

Yes, there are among these Ash'aris later who tried to improve, or some from the *Māturīdiyyah* added the issue of **Acknowledgment (*Iqrār*) by the Tongue**. This is another development in some, but the majority and the main body among them define with the definition I mentioned. And I mentioned to you the defensive speech of Al-Bāqillānī and the major Imams among them who say that Faith is Affirmation only.

So, who is the Imam of this *Madhhab*? **Imam Al-Māturīdī** who is the Imam of this sect or this *Madhhab*. He is **Muḥammad Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī**. His name is Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī al-Samarqandī. He does not have a sufficient biography even in general books; meaning even in biographies of the classes of Ḥanafīs and others and biographies in *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* and others, you find a very small biography although he was a very great Imam and has many followers. And they have books, and I will mention to you very big names in the Islamic world following this Imam Al-Māturīdī. He is Māturīdī attributed to a village named "**Māturīd**," which is near a great big city that was in the history of Islam, the city of **Samarkand**. This city of Samarkand is now within the Republic of Uzbekistan. But its condition now is pitiful after the occupation of the Russians and the former Soviet Union; they destroyed it severely and it is merely remnants of ruins only.

These cities which are called **Transoxiana** (*Bilād Mā Warā' al-Nahr*); this scholar was born in it and grew up in it. And "Beyond the River" refers to a river they used to call in the past the River Jayḥūn (Oxus). This Imam Al-Māturīdī grew up in the lands of Transoxiana which is called Turkestan and what is called the Republics of Central Asia which the Soviets occupied in the past. These are countries neighboring Siberia, China, Iran, India, and Afghanistan. Meaning these ancient countries... and in the countries it occupied called the Five Republics, which are the Republic of Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan. These were among the metropolises of the Islamic world. And these are adjacent to the regions of Khorasan and others. Great scholars graduated from it and from these lands, like Ibn Ḥibbān, Imam Muslim, Al-Ḥākim, Al-Naysābūrī, and others. All these great scholars grew up in these places and these lands and these vast large territories.

He originally was in this period in the days of the **Samanid State** (*Al-Dawlah al-Sāmāniyyah*). He lived under the shadow of the Samanid State. This state was stable in the days of Caliph Al-Ma’mūn. He appointed the father of the founder of this state, Asad ibn Sāmān; appointed him meaning subordinate to the Abbasid Caliphate State in Baghdad. Then after that they remained like this subordinate to the Caliphate. It was a metropolis among the metropolises of Islam in knowledge and jurisprudence, and containing several sects too. The Caliphs or Sultans at that time cared about the sons of Sāmān until they became independent from the year 261 AH to the year 389 AH. It was a very large state. This is the climate in which Al-Māturīdī lived at that time.

Ibn al-Athīr mentioned it at that time. When you read the news of the year 261 AH and afterwards etc., you will find Ibn al-Athīr glorifying this state and writing good words about it. And he mentioned that the Sultans were of praiseworthy conduct and good. Especially these major Sultans of the Samanid State like the founder and Asad and his son Sultan Aḥmad then Sultan Ismā‘īl. This Sultan Ismā‘īl is the one who met with **Shaykhul-Islām Imam Al-Marwazī**, the stallion scholar, the great Imam, a jurist from the Imams of the Shāfi‘ī jurists. When he entered upon Sultan Ismā‘īl al-Sāmānī, he used to stand up for him out of reverence and attend and take knowledge from him. This man was severe against the people of innovation and was revered, honored, considered among the mountains of Islam in knowledge and strength and firmness. He is the one who died in the year 295 AH, Imam Muḥammad ibn Naṣr ibn al-Ḥajjāj al-Marwazī. This is a very great *Ḥāfiẓ* Imam. He stayed there, he was in Nishapur in the region of Khorasan.

Khorasan means the regions close to Iran, they were called Khorasan because they were geographical borders overlapping with Afghanistan. It is said about it "Land of the Sun." He lived there and died, may Allah have mercy on him, in Samarkand in Uzbekistan as I told you.

This is the environment in which Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī grew up. It was full of argumentation and discussions. The Sultan used to sit in the palace and gather scholars and they debate and discuss. The Sultan starts with a question to one of the scholars and the other responds to him. But they were of praiseworthy conduct as we told you. This land was divided among sects; for example in these vast regions, there are regions where the followers of Imam Abū Ḥanīfah predominate. Some of them dominated by the *Mu‘tazilah*. Some provinces for example in the region of Sijistan and Herat had a group of *Khawārij*. The *Mu‘tazilah* were mostly in the region of Nishapur but not with this strength. The Shiites and *Karrāmiyyah* were also in the same regions in Nishapur and others. But the predominance in

all these places was for the followers of Abū Ḥanīfah, except in limited areas which were in Al-Shāsh, Ṭūs, Nasā, and Abīward.

There were some Shāfi'īs, large masses of Shāfi'ī Imams in those places too. And Herat, Nishapur, Al-Shāsh, Nasā, and Abīward. Herat which is a great city from these big cities also from the cities of Khorasan. Also in Nishapur, Imam Al-Naysābūrī... Imam Al-Ḥākim was and Muslim was from the same regions. And also a huge number of famous scholars of Nishapur.

And from Al-Shāsh, Imam Abū Bakr al-Qaffāl al-Shāshī the famous scholar, a stallion from the great Shāfi'ī stallions. And also the city of Ṭūs which was opened in the days of our master 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* and from it is Al-Ṭūsī and others of the great Imams.

And from it **Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī** was born and grew up in this city too. In Nasā, a city also in Khorasan in regions near Iran there. And this city also, from it was Imam **Al-Nasā'ī** author of the famous *Sunan*. And the city of Abīward. Also it was close to the cities from which was Imam **Al-Sarkhasī**, the city of Sarakhs. These are great names you find in all books of history, biographies, and conquests. Meaning the lands of Transoxiana were all opened generally; because they were being opened and people apostatized etc. It was opened in the era of our master 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, reached places in Afghanistan. Then opened in the days of our master 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān. And the conquest continued like this until in the days of Qutaybah ibn Muslim these armies reached Kashgar and East Turkestan which China occupies now, in the year 93 AH. All these cities were subordinate to Muslims up to the borders of China.

Even China itself, the lands it occupied like East Turkestan, changed its name and it was among the major metropolises of Islam. Unfortunately, all this was destroyed and changed. And these places did not produce scholars for us later, after this communist eradication whether from China then after that from the Russians or Soviets. Even those who appeared now in these vast republics, you find people very absent-minded, knowing nothing about their religion. The communists destroyed them severely and assassinated the identity of this Ummah in these very strong vast places.

And these originally most of them are Muslims. This is the environment in which these great scholars grew up, among them Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī, the owner of the *Madhhab* you hear about and he has special opinions. Scholars said he died in the year 383 AH, and some said 338. There are differences but the famous view is he died in the year 333 AH. And that Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī died in the year 324 AH. Abū

al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī is the founder of the Ash'ari *Madhhab* attributed to him. He authored *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* and *Al-Ibānah* in which there is a very big retreat to *Ahl al-Sunnah* later, except in issues where he was influenced by Ibn Kullāb and the *Mu‘tazilah* unfortunately.

We spoke about the difference between the old *Ash‘āriyyah* and late *Ash‘āriyyah*. And so the *Māturīdiyyah* in the same way. You can hardly differentiate between them except in simple issues. From the strange wonders and oddities naturally is that these two sister *Madhhabs* or the creedal and intellectual twinning close in very many things in most ideas and opinions... **Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī did not meet Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī**, and there is no meeting between them at all. Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī is from the people of Samarkand there in Uzbekistan, and he is a **Ḥanafī** Imam following the school of Imam Abū Ḥanīfah. And Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī is from the city of Basra, grew up in Iraq, and his *Madhhab* was in Iraq, and he is **Shāfi‘ī**. Meaning this is a Ḥanafī Imam and the other is Shāfi‘ī.

And the theologians (*Mutakallimūn*), as **Ṭāshkubrīzādeh** said, and he is among the major Māturīdī scholars and is Ḥanafī too, said: "The heads of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah* in *‘Ilm al-Kalām* are two; one is Ḥanafī and the other is Shāfi‘ī. The Ḥanafī is Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī, and the other Shāfi‘ī is the Sheikh of the Sunnah." Grand and very huge titles, especially in the books of the Ḥanafīs and specifically in the book *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyyah al-Kubrā* by Al-Subkī, because he was fanatic for the *Ash‘āriyyah*, very extreme. But although there is no meeting between them, **how did this strange agreement happen** in these opinions and the similarity in issues of Faith in a form that is almost quasi-identical?! Meaning practical correlation in definition. Meaning the *Māturīdiyyah* and *Ash‘āriyyah* in Faith define it by the linguistic meaning, which is Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*), like the definition of the *Jahmiyyah*. How did this happen?

Some researchers tried to combine between this and that. They said maybe the reason is that the **Kullābiyyah**, followers of Sa‘īd ibn Kullāb, by whom Al-Ash‘arī was influenced as I told you after the age of forty... he exited and took off the garment of *I‘tizāl* and found in the opinions of Ibn Kullāb good ideas so was influenced by the *Madhhab* of the *Kullābiyyah*. Although historians say he also did not meet Ibn Kullāb himself but was influenced by his students. So the combiner between them might be as follows: That the *Kullābiyyah* were widespread in Khorasan and regions of Transoxiana. And since Al-Ash‘arī was influenced in Baghdad and Basra and Iraq by the opinions of the *Kullābiyyah*, here a mixing occurred. So the one who transferred and pollinated the ideas for

the two and gathered them in refuting the *Mu'tazilah*, because the *Māturīdiyyah* were refuting the *Mu'tazilah*, and the *Kullābiyyah* were refuting the *Mu'tazilah*, and Al-Ash'arī also when he exited wanted to refute the *Mu'tazilah* so he took words of Ibn Kullāb and the *Kullābiyyah*, thus the one who gathered and married between them was the *Kullābiyyah*. Because the *Kullābiyyah* were in between; they had certain innovated ideas and had ideas influenced also by *Ahl al-Sunnah*. So it gathered between them in reconciliation.

Therefore, the secret that makes us wonder in the story of why this compatibility, harmony, and agreement between the *Māturīdiyyah* and *Ash'āriyyah* is that they were all influenced by the *Kullābiyyah* which was widespread at that time in Khorasan and appeared also in Basra and Baghdad and so on. Because scholars used to move around, and students likewise used to transport some treatises and books in the Islamic world easily before Sykes-Picot and the fragmentation and these obstacles they put before Muslims now. So this is what gathered between them.

And Al-Māturīdī now has a printed book named ***Kitāb al-Tawḥīd***. They consider this among the precious books (*Nafā'is*), which is an exaggeration from them. But believe me, the books of these people, whether *Al-'Aqīdah al-Nasafiyyah* by Al-Nasafī, who is Māturīdī too, and also books authored in issues of creeds by the Theologians and by Al-Rāzī and Al-Juwaynī and others; all these books, you find darkness in them, disturbing and uncomfortable too. When you read for example *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd* [of Maturidi], there is no smoothness and ease in it. Meaning when you read the book of Imam Al-Ājurrī, you find easy simple speech even though he died in 360 AH. And before him Ibn Sallām and also Imam Ibn Baṭṭah and others. We will not speak about Ibn Taymiyyah now. These ancient books of creed according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and treatises of Imam Aḥmad, and treatises of Imam Al-Awzā'ī, and treatises inserted in some books by Al-Layth ibn Sa'd and others; you find ease in it and find the spirit of religion. As for these, they were influenced by philosophers and these translations that appeared in the days of Caliph Al-Ma'mūn.

So the *Ash'āriyyah* and *Māturīdiyyah* debated the *Mu'tazilah*, yet despite that they were influenced by the *Mu'tazilah*. They were influenced by the *Mu'tazilah* for example in the issue of **Prioritizing Reason over Revelation** and exaggerated in the subject. And influenced by the *Mu'tazilah* for example in the subject of **Metaphor** (*Majāz*) in the Holy Qur'an, and exaggerated in interpreting Names and Attributes and relied on their minds in these issues; Face they interpret as Essence, Hand means Power, Highness (*Fawqiyyah*) means Encompassing and Power, Rising (*Istiwā'*) means Conquering. They went to refute the *Mu'tazilah*, so the

Mu‘tazilah are the ones who influenced them. Therefore Shaykhul-Islām **Imam Al-Harawī,** and he is a great scholar; Shāfi‘īs say Shāfi‘ī and Ḥanbalīs say Ḥanbalī but he was influenced by both, was exposed to execution seven or eight times due to his debate with the *Ash‘āriyyah*. He almost got executed several times while he was there in the lands of Khorasan. He used to say about the *Ash‘āriyyah* that they are like **"The Females of the Mu‘tazilah"** (*Ināth al-Mu‘tazilah*), just as the *Mu‘tazilah* were called "Effeminates of the Khawārij." This one used to call them Females of the *Mu‘tazilah* or Effeminates of the *Mu‘tazilah*; because the *Mu‘tazilah* were bolder than them in certain issues in the issue of Reason and others.

So the influence of the *Mu‘tazilah* was great on them even though they are Ash'aris and say they rose to fight the *Mu‘tazilah*. But in the end they were influenced by many things like **Single Report** (*Khabar al-Wāḥid*). For the *Ash‘āriyyah*, they do not rely on the Single Report in issues of creeds, and say creeds are not proven by the Single Report. This is influence from the *Mu‘tazilah*, for the *Mu‘tazilah* are the ones who say that. So the *Ash‘āriyyah* do not acknowledge the Single Report in creeds unless the report is *Mutawātir* (mass transmitted). This is a calamity and a very big disaster. Scholars refuted them in the past, Ibn Taymiyyah refuted them, scholars of the *Salaf* who were contemporary to the *Ash‘āriyyah* in their beginning in the fourth Hijri century and fifth century refuted them and debunked these doubts. Among the most severe people with them, and he has very dangerous judgments against them regarding their innovation, is Imam Al-Harawī.

So you find in *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd* by Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī darkness. And these books of theirs, even the educational books *Al-‘Aqīdah al-Nasafiyyah* taught to children and *Jawharat al-Tawḥīd* and others; all these are dark phrases, you find harshness in them when reading, and philosophy in expression and so on. Even the poems in which they summarized books of creed or their ideas in poems, you find darkness in them. Even their writings in *Uṣūl* (Principles) and others.

I give you a comparison between two Imams and the difference is very big. **Imam Al-Shāfi‘ī** *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi* owner of the great *Madhhab*, died in the year 204 AH. Read his book ***Al-Risālah*** in *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* (Principles of Jurisprudence). It is the greatest and oldest book, and it is almost attributed to him that he is the first to write in *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*. Believe me, if you deleted the name of Imam Al-Shāfi‘ī, you would think one of the authors in our era authored it now. Ease of expression, spirit, citing the Holy Qur'an. Although Imam Al-Shāfi‘ī is among the Imams of Arabic language, and was distinguished over most Imams. Imam Al-Shāfi‘ī

was truly a reference in Arabic language. Despite that, look at his expressions and ease. May Allah have mercy on Sheikh Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir, he brought out this book for us and edited it in a wonderful editing and additions of utmost magnificence. This is the book *Al-Risālah* in *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*; as if an author in a modern university wrote this.

Compare for example one of those attributed to Imam Al-Shāfi'ī in *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*, as a comparison in expressions, for example the book ***Al-Mustaṣfā*** by **Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī**. He is a great Imam, died in the year 505 AH. Meaning the difference between them is three centuries. If you read, you will find **darkness** in the expression and introductions he innovated and invented; "The First Pole" and "The Second Pole," naming things as poles, and "Methods of Investment," and "Clarification of Restricting the Sources of Sciences." Then he names the arts and divides them, "The First Art in Laws," and the method of Theologians. The beginning of the book, first forty fifty pages, possibly if a poor beginner reads, he will hate *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*. If he reads and has no prior background, when he reads the introductions mentioned by Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī in his book *Al-Mustaṣfā*, he will find strange and dark things. By the time he reaches the core of the book he will get dizzy, until he reaches the issues he spoke about later regarding Consensus (*Ijmā'*), *Tawātur,* Abrogation (*Naskh*) and its conditions, and other famous jurisprudential chapters.

And so on, even in the books of Al-Rāzī and others. All these books, you find darkness in them. This is in books of *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* as a comparison. You find the ancients writing easy expressions. Even from the Successors, you find treatises reaching us of utmost ease in expression, and issues were not of this complexity. But we find Imam Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī saying: "**He who does not learn Logic, understands nothing in the sciences.**"

Naturally the Imams refuted him. **Al-Māzarī** in the Murābiṭīn State refuted him when the books appeared later and they wanted to burn his books. His saying: "He who does not learn Logic understands nothing in sciences" implies that the Companions who spread this religion and this knowledge, and these Successors, there was no Logic in their days nor anything, so how can this be said!!

This is very dangerous speech and he was fought for it. Imam Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī is the author of the famous book ***Iḥyā' 'Ulūm al-Dīn***. It is a book containing dangerous things and errors even creedal in his book. Some scholars edited this book. He who reads *Mukhtaṣar 'Ulūm al-Dīn* [Summary] is better than the book *Al-Iḥyā'* completely; because some

expressions... unless the book is edited by a person having knowledge of creed and principles of verification and science of Hadith and referencing (*Takhrīj*). But it was said the man in the end of his life died with the book *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* on his chest, and it was said he died upon the Sunnah, *raḥimahullāhu Ta‘ālā*.

The witness here is that these books they authored in Creed and in *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*, you find them dark, harsh expressions. The early ones were not of this darkness and these coarse expressions. If you read the book *Al-Mustaṣfā* and you do not know who the author is, one would think this was authored before Islam in the Jāhiliyyah era. And if he saw the book of Imam Al-Shāfi‘ī, he would think this is a contemporary book.

Meaning he tells you in this century... [this is] proof that the scholars of the *Salaf* used to cite abundantly the Holy Qur'an and Prophetic Hadiths and sayings of the *Salaf*. And their expressions were easy, simple, containing no talismans nor logarithms nor philosophical complexities by which these people were influenced unfortunately after these translations that appeared in the days of Caliph Al-Ma’mūn and after him.

So this is a quick overview of Imam Al-Māturīdī and where he was born and when he died.

Some might say: **What is the difference between the Māturīdiyyah and the Ash‘āriyyah?**

Yes, I told you that the two *Madhhabs*, *Māturīdiyyah* and *Ash‘āriyyah*, are **Jahmiyyah in the definition of Faith**, mostly. The majority of *Māturīdiyyah* with the majority of *Ash‘āriyyah* are *Jahmiyyah* in defining Faith. Meaning Faith according to them is Knowledge or Heart Affirmation only, they expelled Action. Meaning one believed with his heart and his tongue did not pronounce and he did not do anything and died, meaning he did not pray, did not give zakat, did not perform Hajj, did not fight jihad, did not do anything, according to them he died a believer with complete faith. And we told you before that the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah*, the creed of the Companions, the creed of the Righteous *Salaf*, this creed of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, has **Three Pillars**: Affirmation in the heart, Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*) or Knowledge (*Ma‘rifah*) mean one thing [in context of internal conviction], and Speech by the tongue and Action by the pillars. And we detailed and said Affirmation here by the heart does not mean Affirmation that the heart does not act. No, the heart has action; affirmation by speech and affirmation by action, meaning **Action of the Hearts** like fear, awe, hope, and supplication. All this is called action, action of the hearts (*their hearts tremble*), (*they fear their Lord*), by hearts like this.

As for these *Ash'āriyyah*, *Jahmiyyah*, and *Murji'ah*, all these deny even action of the heart. We believe in both together: action of the heart and speech of the heart, Affirmation or Knowledge, and Acknowledgment by the tongue, the human acknowledges: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*). And we said Action by the pillars is the **Genus of Action**; establishes prayer and gives zakat and prays and fasts.

So *Ahl al-Sunnah* have three pillars; whoever does not bring them together is not a believer. The three must be together, otherwise no. But why did the majority of scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah* not declare the Imams who said that disbelievers? There are scholars who declared them disbelievers, some scholars in the past like Al-Harawī and others. Even Jahm ibn Ṣafwān and others, some declared him disbeliever. But the *Jahmiyyah* in general, they did not declare them disbelievers. Okay, regarding the *Ash'āriyyah* and *Māturīdiyyah*, some of them say the same definition. Naturally Ibn Taymiyyah and others said: They might have the doubt of declaring Allah transcendent (*Tanzīh*), the doubt of Interpretation (*Ta'wīl*), error in interpretation, things like this. This is what they considered a barrier preventing the application of *Kufr* upon them as **Specific Individuals** (*Mu'ayyanīn*). Here the issue differs; because Muḥammad and Zayd and 'Alī, this requires establishing the proof upon them, asking him "What is your belief? What is the doubt?", removing the doubt for him first.

But what happens is that some people... most common Muslims do not understand such details. He says to you "I am Ash'ari" and is proud he is Ash'ari or Jahmi or proud he believes this, but perhaps he understands nothing of the principles of the *Madhhab* itself. One says to you "I am Shāfi'ī" and he does not know these principles upon which Imam Al-Shāfi'ī built his principles. Or says "I am Ḥanbalī" and he does not know the principles of Imam Aḥmad.

But people... there is one who says to me: "I am Ash'ari and believe in Ash'arism." I said to him, I simply know he is not like that: "And what is the first obligation upon the responsible person (*Mukallaf*) to believe in?" He said: "To testify *Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*." So I laughed and said to him: "What is your opinion that the *Ash'āriyyah* basically do not say that? They say the first obligation upon the responsible person is: **Deduction** (*Istidlāl*) and **Knowing the Lord**, and this knowledge is called 'The First Knowledge.' He is not a believer deserving reward and Paradise except by Deduction and Reason etc., and using his mind." This is speech contrary to the Holy Qur'an, contrary to the Prophetic Sunnah,

contrary to the Companions. This is not the guidance of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* and not the guidance of Islam.

So people sometimes are impressed by some beautiful terms, or some people have knowledge but are deceived by the names of big scholars in this regard. Meaning for example, this made me speak on the issue of some books. For example, there are books speaking about Ash'arism, books so many in praising Ash'arism. If we speak about contemporary books for example, there is a book by a person printed in Egypt. This book was printed by **Dār Al-Salām**. And this Dār Al-Salām... I asked about it, it was said to me that Dār Al-Salām in Cairo or Mansoura, certain places in Egypt, is headed by a group from the [Muslim] Brotherhood. The Brotherhood also unfortunately are influenced by Ash'arism in some issues. A book named ***‘Aqā’id al-Ash‘ariyyah*** (Creeds of the Ash'aris) in a quiet dialogue with the doubts of opponents. This book frankly is by an author named **Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ibn Aḥmad al-Idlibī**. This is... neither Ṣalāḥ (righteousness) nor anything. The man invents a dialogue in the manner of the *Murāja‘āt* of ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn the Shiite, this one who claimed he met Sheikh Al-Azhar Al-Bishrī, and the family of Al-Bishrī refuted him and denied this, Sheikh Al-Azhar Al-Bishrī who is the grandfather of Dr. Ṭāriq ‘Abd al-Ḥalīm, the famous author of books. So they refuted him.

And this one is the same story. He says: "The researcher said... and I say." He claimed that a researcher has a book refuting the *Ash‘āriyyah* and he replied to his doubts and opinions. Who is this speech? Who is this researcher? He did not mention to us who the researcher is, what is the name of the book essentially so we return to the source and reference? As is their habit. Then he comes and shows you... when you read you say: "This is a naive researcher, weak in argument, and he [the author], *mā shā’ Allāh*, is strong when he relies on things and cuts them." Meaning a strange book. Meaning frankly I contacted some brother publishers who have relations in Egypt, I said to them: "Tell this Dār Al-Salām to fear Allah regarding this misguidance and these misleading books." And in a dialogue from the imagination of the writer. This author is an extreme Ash'ari, malicious in his transmission, disparaged too. How does he transmit the like of this in a book? And this book is published and sold in beautiful luxurious printing. They printed it about two years ago, this book 2008 AD First Edition in Dār Al-Salām. So fear Allah O brother, these are books to be warned against.

Among books we warn against also is a book named ***Maqālāt Abī al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī*** by **Ibn Fūrak**. I told you he is a great Imam of the Ash'ari theologians, Al-Ḥasan ibn Fūrak who died in 406 AH. What did he do? He took general speech from the creed of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī and

made it into a book. Meaning he published this speech. The problem is not here. Ibn Fūrak is known to be an extremist and known to be a fanatic and among the fanatics of Ash'arism. It was said that the Sultan, as I told you, Ibn Subuktigīn, as Al-Bājī said and Ibn Ḥazm also transmitted; because he spoke bad things or when he said the Messenger died so he is not a Prophet now and his soul is not in Paradise like this, so he ordered his killing. And it was said he was imprisoned and poisoned after that.

But the witness here is that the editing of the editor... A dangerous book due to the editing of the editor. Had the book been left alone... But the editor titled thus: "Editing and Adjusting by Professor Dr. **Aḥmad ʻAbd al-Raḥīm al-Sāyiḥ**, Maktabat al-Thaqāfah al-Dīniyyah, Cairo, First Edition." This is printed in the year 2005 AD. And this book, the editor says, look at the fabrication, an extreme grave-worshipping (*Qubūrī*) Ash'ari writer and a liar too. He lies even in his editing. He lies also when he says: "How does Sheikh Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʻarī exit from the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah* —while he is a Sheikh in it— to a *Madhhab* closer to the *Mushabbihah* and *Mujassimah*?" Meaning he denies his exit. When it was said the Imam exited in the end of his life and returned to the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in his book *Al-Ibānah* and *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*. "If Sheikh Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʻarī exited from the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, then why did his students not obey him and follow him while he is great and esteemed among them?"

Therefore this writer considers that this subject is from the fabrications of the "**Ḥashawiyyah**," and very bad speech against Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah and so on. And he says that the book *Al-Ibānah* and *Risālat Ahl al-Thaghr* imply the return of Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʻarī from the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah* upon which he was [according to the writer, meaning Ash'arism] to the *Madhhab* of *Mujassimah* and *Mushabbihah* among those who attribute themselves to Salafism falsely and slanderously. He naturally denies this. Okay, and Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ʻAsākir, what would you say? And I told you before he is the one who mentioned in the book *Tabyīn Kadhib al-Muftarī* that *Al-Ibānah* is from the writings of Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʻarī and affirmed texts that he affirms Highness and affirms that the Most Merciful rose over the Throne, contrary to all these.

So, Imam Al-Māturīdī and Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʻarī agree on things and differ. Sheikh Al-Subkī, author of *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʻiyyah al-Kubrā*, mentioned that they differed, meaning the difference between *Māturīdiyyah* and *Ashʻāriyyah* as a total, in about thirteen issues. And some of them said: twenty issues, and so on. These are issues that are not counted (significant), considered very simple issues. But the strongest defining

issue between the two are **Two Issues**: Of very strong issues but in branches. Al-Māturīdī for example resembles *Ahl al-Sunnah* in some issues and Al-Ash‘arī too. But in an issue like the issue of **Qadar** (Divine Decree), it is the strongest issue in which the *Ash‘āriyyah* opposed the *Māturīdiyyah*.

Naturally they oppose them in *Qadar* and oppose them in the issue of **Improvement and Detriment** (*Taḥsīn wa Taqbīḥ*) and oppose them in some issues not major. But the issue of *Qadar* is the strongest of these issues. The issue of *Qadar* like what? The *Ash‘āriyyah* are **Jahmiyyah** in *Qadar*. Meaning Jahm was a Jabri (Determinist) and the *Ash‘āriyyah* were and still are **Jabriyyah** in *Qadar*. *Jabriyyah* means what? Meaning the human is compelled (*majbūr*) in his actions. The human is merely a machine, Allah is the One who created everything for him, and his actions have no effect in the Will (*Mashī’ah*) at all, no effect, there is no effect, merely a moving machine. So they are *Jabriyyah* here, opposite to the *Qadariyyah* and they are the *Mu‘tazilah* for example. The *Mu‘tazilah Qadariyyah* are the ones who denied *Qadar*, meaning they said the human is the one who creates his actions, no relation to Allah. (*Al-Qadar unuf*) meaning initiated anew, finished. Meaning from the beginning Allah did not create these actions, the servant created them; drinks, eats, hit so-and-so, exited; these are actions the servant created.

And this is the opposite of the *Ash‘āriyyah*. The *Ash‘āriyyah* say all these he is compelled upon, Allah created them. The **Māturīdiyyah**, their opinion is close to the opinion of *Ahl al-Sunnah*: They divided it, said: There are actions and commands. Things the human is compelled upon and the action has no effect, and there are things no, the action of the human has an effect. And this is the opinion of *Ahl al-Sunnah* too in these issues. For the human might be compelled mechanically in things like illness, like stomach movement; in these the human is compelled. What they call "compelled (*musayyar*) and choosing (*mukhayyar*)." Then after that the human can do it and move and eat and drink. Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* makes for the human an effective action. But if He wills that the human eats, Allah creates the action for him, meaning He does the thing.

As for the *Ash‘āriyyah*, they say: This does not exist at all. And Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī tried to come [with a view] in some issues and some major Ash'aris, but a very precise issue and all of it dark things. Therefore the subject of *Qadar* is of utmost danger. Therefore *Qadar* is the secret of Allah the Exalted in His creation as Imam Al-Ṭaḥāwī said. And no drawn-near angel nor sent prophet was informed of this. We believe in *Qadar*, its good and its bad. And we believe that what Allah willed happened and what He did not will did not happen. And that Allah is not questioned about His actions. This is the summary of the issue of *Qadar*.

And the issue of *Qadar* is of utmost danger. Therefore as I told you that Imam **Al-Ājurrī** when he authored a book, because these issues started spreading before his era, therefore he wrote a refutation of utmost purpose, which is the summary of the belief of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the issue of *Qadar*. It is the Chapter of Refuting the *Qadariyyah*. Because he said: "If a questioner asked about our *Madhhab* in *Qadar*, the answer to that before we inform him of our *Madhhab* is that we advise the questioner and teach him that it is not proper for Muslims to excavate and search into *Qadar*; because *Qadar* is a secret among the secrets of Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*. Rather, belief in what the Decrees brought of good or evil is obligatory upon the servants to believe in. Then the servant is not safe if he researches *Qadar* that he might deny the Decrees of Allah running upon the servants, so he strays from the paths of truth. The Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said: ('No nation perished ever except by Shirk with Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*, and no nation committed Shirk until the beginning of its affair and its Shirk was: Denial of *Qadar*')."

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn *raḥimahullāh* said: "Had not the Companions *raḍiyallāhu 'anhum* when news reached them about a misguided people who strayed from the path of truth and denied *Qadar*, refuted their saying, and insulted them and declared them disbelievers... And likewise the Successors to them in goodness insulted whoever spoke about *Qadar* and denied it and cursed them and forbade sitting with them. And likewise the Imams of Muslims forbid sitting with the *Qadariyyah* and debating them and clarified to the Muslims the ugliness of their doctrines. Had not these refuted the *Qadariyyah*, it would not have been permitted for those after them to speak on *Qadar*. Rather belief in *Qadar*, its good and its bad, is obligatory. Decree and Destiny. What He decreed happens, and what He did not decree does not happen. So if the servant acted in obedience to Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*, he knows it is by the success (*tawfīq*) of Allah for him so he thanks Him for that. And if he acted in His disobedience he regrets that, and knows it is by a decree that ran upon him, so he blames himself and seeks forgiveness from Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*. This is the *Madhhab* of the Muslims. And no one has an argument against Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*, rather to Allah belongs the conclusive argument against His creation. Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* said: (*Say, "To Allah belongs the conclusive argument. If He had willed, He would have guided you all."*) [QS. Al-An'ām: 149]. Then know, may Allah have mercy on us and you, that our *Madhhab* in *Qadar* is to say: That Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* created Paradise and created the Fire, and for each of them are inhabitants. And He swore by His Might that He will fill Hell from Jinn and mankind all together. Then He created Adam *'alayhis salām* and extracted from his back every

offspring He is creating until the Day of Resurrection. Then He made them two parties, a party in Paradise and a party in the Blaze."

Then he detailed a great detail in his book *Al-Sharī‘ah* about the issue of *Qadar*. This is a great Sunni Imam of high status, this Imam Al-Ājurrī says regarding issues of *Qadar* briefly.

And frankly, the best who wrote on *Qadar* in this subject and refuted and innovated [in good explanation] and debunked the doubts of the *Jabriyyah* and *Qadariyyah* and every Tom, Dick, and Harry, even the people of sects and religions and Jews and Christians, is this great Imam **Ibn al-Qayyim** *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi* in his book ***Shifā’ al-‘Alīl***. This book is of utmost magnificence and strength and strong evidences and is divided wonderfully. And Imam Ibn al-Qayyim is the student of Imam Ibn Taymiyyah, *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhimā jamī‘an*. Whoever wants to understand many things, read the book *Shifā’ al-‘Alīl fī Masā’il al-Qaḍā’ wa al-Qadar wa al-Ḥikmah wa al-Ta‘līl*. He refuted the subject of **Reasoning of Rulings** (*Ta‘līl al-Aḥkām*) against those who deny the reasoning of rulings, like the *Ash‘āriyyah*; for they deny reasoning of rulings, and say rulings are not reasoned originally, and they have calamities. But the *Māturīdiyyah* oppose them in some issues, in the issue of Improvement and Detriment. Meaning the *Māturīdiyyah* are better than them in the issue of *Qadar* and the issue of Improvement and Detriment.

So Imam Ibn al-Qayyim in his book *Shifā’ al-‘Alīl* mentioned all these doubts, and refuted them in his beautiful debate between a *Qadarī* and a Sunni, meaning deniers of *Qadar*, and mentioned debates between a *Jabrī* and a Sunni, and mentioned the doubts of those resentful of Wisdom and Reasoning, and mentioned many things in the principles of Faith in *Qadar*, its good and its bad, and things of utmost magnificence. And I consider this book among the best books in issues of Decree and Destiny. But an advice to the youths who want to read such books: please read books before that. Because Ibn al-Qayyim and Ibn Taymiyyah, as I said and repeat to you, have details and many ramifications, you might get dizzy with them in some issues. Sometimes he details and digresses a lot in subjects, you think this is his opinion while it is in reality the opinion of another one, meaning refuting a certain doubt. Therefore a person must know the key to the personality of the scholar whose book he will read.

So we advise the youths to read simple books. For example, "Chapter of Qadar in *Al-‘Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah*" in explanations of *Al-‘Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* is very good. They can read it and read the commentators of *Al-‘Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* in the point "Qadar is the secret of Allah the Exalted in His creation, no drawn-near angel nor sent

prophet was informed of that." Also there are some contemporary books in issues of Decree and Destiny, and they are frankly very many books. A person can return to such books if confused. For example, Sheikh **'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Maḥmūd** has a good book on the subject of Decree and Destiny in a very beautiful summary, a very valuable book. And there are some PhD and Master's theses on the subject of Decree and Destiny by known scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

So the difference between them is in issues of *Qadar*. Whoever wants to read in detail should read at least the book *Shifā' al-'Alīl* by Ibn al-Qayyim and rest. But after reading other books in the beginning or summaries in the beginning. Because Ibn al-Qayyim and even Ibn Taymiyyah in his book *Dar' Ta'āruḍ al-'Aql wa al-Naql* mentions such things a lot. And in his book *Ijtimā' al-Juyūsh al-Islāmiyyah* Ibn al-Qayyim mentioned this also in his refutation of the *Jahmiyyah*. These... Ibn Taymiyyah's and Ibn al-Qayyim's books are always full of such debates and refutations. And truly because they were able to refine the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in this big issue and in many issues; Names and Attributes and Faith, they refined it from the impurities of the *Ash'āriyyah* and all these people of sects.

We said some issues in which they differed also is the issue of **Improvement and Detriment** (*Taḥsīn wa Taqbīḥ*). The *Māturīdiyyah* and *Ash'āriyyah* differed in it. This issue of Improvement and Detriment, you will find it with the theologians and some books of creeds, they mention these issues a lot. This issue originally was mentioned by Ibn al-Qayyim and he refuted beautifully in the book *Ijtimā' al-Juyūsh al-Islāmiyyah* and quoted words also by Ibn Taymiyyah. And Ibn Taymiyyah also refuted this issue and detailed it well in his books like *Kitāb al-Istiqāmah* and others. But what is the summary of this issue? What is the meaning of Good (*Ḥasan*) and Bad/Ugly (*Qabīḥ*)?

We know that *Ḥasan* is the good thing, and *Qabīḥ* is the blameworthy thing. This is the concept. The *Mu'tazilah* for example raised the issue as follows: They said a thing is either good in itself or bad in itself. So they unleashed the Mind (*'Aql*) and said since the Mind can distinguish between Good and Bad, then even if the Sharia did not come, people are questioned and held accountable. So for example there is no Sharia regarding the prohibition of anything; if your mind told you this is a good and fine thing, and you committed the bad, Allah holds you accountable. Even if Qur'anic verses were not revealed and prohibition or permission did not descend. The good thing, if you did it you are rewarded for it. And this bad thing, if you committed it and perpetrated it, you are recompensed

for it and punished for it in the Hereafter. This is the summary of the opinion of the *Mu'tazilah*.

As for the *Ash'āriyyah*, they were on the contrary. They said the command is with Allah *Subḥānah*, He is the One who says by the Sharia "This is bad and this is good." The thing, both matters are equal in it, and Allah is the One who made it bad or Allah described it as good. The Mind has no entry at all into this issue. This is what the *Ash'āriyyah* mentioned, the opposite of the *Mu'tazilah*. The *Mu'tazilah* said the Mind determines good and bad even if the Sharia did not descend. The *Ash'āriyyah* said everything belongs to the Sharia, it is what says is it good or bad even if it opposed the Mind.

Therefore they assumed assumption —Glory be to Allah, had they adhered to the Sharia and what the guidance of the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* and Companions were upon!— meaning for example they say: Is it permissible for Allah to send a Messenger who is a disbeliever? Or send a Messenger who is immoral? *Wal-'iyādhu billāh*. They said: If He willed that, He would do it from the rational perspective, but He did not do it because it is not present in the Sharia. They say it is permissible. Why? Because if He commanded the disbeliever to be a Messenger —*Astaghfirullāh*!— meaning the fact He named him Messenger, then He willed that, so it is Good. Although the Mind says this man is corrupt, drunkard, polytheist, so how do you say Allah burdens him with this!! This is confusion and I do not want to mention examples of this so you do not get dizzy.

So the *Mu'tazilah* unleashed [the mind] and the others closed the thing entirely and made Allah's actions [pure] Will as if Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* does not have the attribute of *Al-Ḥakīm* (The Wise). For the Wise is the one who puts the thing in its place. How does the Mind tell you that this act is good while you say Allah might burden a disbeliever and make him a Messenger!! They stripped Wisdom. *Astaghfirullāh al-'Aẓīm*! This is the opinion of the *Ash'āriyyah* and their books are full of that.

Therefore the *Māturīdiyyah* opposed them and inclined towards *Ahl al-Sunnah*. They said: The issue has detail; Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* created in the human a mind that can determine good and bad. But this Improvement and Detriment, the servant is not held accountable for it except by the Sharia. But before the Sharia he is not held accountable for it. Meaning the mind, before the existence of a verse or any Hadith, and the mind said that the thing is bad and the human committed it; here the human is not punished for it; because there is no Sharia. The Sharia did not forbid this thing although it is bad, but no legislation descended regarding it. So

Ahl al-Sunnah and *Māturīdiyyah* are together now. There are other details leave them aside, but we speak in general now.

Therefore Ibn al-Qayyim refuted with good refutations against this, and cited very many evidences for this. He said: Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* says in the Qur'an proof that this is false, those who negated Rational Good and Bad:

يَأْمُرُهُم بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَيَنْهَاهُمْ عَنِ الْمُنكَرِ

"He enjoins upon them what is right and forbids them what is wrong." [QS. Al-A'rāf: 157]

If there was no meaning for "Right" (*Ma'rūf*) except what they were commanded with, and no "Wrong" (*Munkar*) except what was forbidden, as the *Ash'āriyyah* claim, the meaning of the verse according to the *Madhhab* of the *Ash'āriyyah*, if their speech were correct, would be: "He commands them with what He commands them and forbids them from what He forbids them." And this speech, individual rational people are above it, let alone the speech of the Lord of the Worlds, *wal-'iyādhu billāh*. For Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* says: (*He enjoins upon them what is right*), and the Right, rational people know it. (*And forbids them what is wrong*), so there is Wrong which rational people know. Is it reasonable that He says to them (*He enjoins upon them what is right and forbids them what is wrong*) while they do not know what is the meaning of Right and what is the meaning of Wrong?! This is speech of utmost danger among the *Ash'āriyyah*, for they negate that basically.

And Ibn al-Qayyim also cites against them His saying, the Exalted:

وَيُحِلُّ لَهُمُ الطَّيِّبَاتِ وَيُحَرِّمُ عَلَيْهِمُ الْخَبَائِثَ

"And makes lawful for them the good things and prohibits for them the evil." [QS. Al-A'rāf: 157]

This is explicit that the lawful was good (*ṭayyib*) before its lawfulness, and that the evil (*khabīth*) was evil before its prohibition. And the goodness of this and evilness of this was not derived from the lawfulness and prohibition itself.

So when are people held accountable? They are held accountable after the Text. But before the Text, people are not held accountable if they died upon that. If one ate from the evil things, although the mind tells him these are evil things and filthy, but the Sharia did not descend, so he is not punished for it; because there is no text.

Ibn al-Qayyim also refuted them regarding the saying of Allah the Exalted:

قُلْ إِنَّمَا حَرَّمَ رَبِّيَ الْفَوَاحِشَ مَا ظَهَرَ مِنْهَا وَمَا بَطَنَ وَالْإِثْمَ وَالْبَغْيَ بِغَيْرِ الْحَقِّ

"Say, 'My Lord has only forbidden immoralities - what is apparent of them and what is concealed - and sin, and oppression without right.'" [QS. Al-A‘rāf: 33]

This is proof that immoralities (*fawāḥish*) in themselves are not considered good by minds, so prohibition was attached to them due to their immorality. (*Say, 'My Lord has only forbidden immoralities'*), so the Arabs and rational people know what immoralities are before even the descent of the text.

وَلَا تَقْرَبُوا الزِّنَىٰ ۖ إِنَّهُ كَانَ فَاحِشَةً وَسَاءَ سَبِيلًا

"And do not approach unlawful sexual intercourse. Indeed, it is ever an immorality and is evil as a way." [QS. Al-isrā’: 32]

He reasoned the prohibition by the forbidden thing being an immorality. So rational people know the being of this as immorality. Ibn al-Qayyim published this speech in his books in *Ijtimā‘ al-Juyūsh al-Islāmiyyah* and in *Shifā’ al-‘Alīl* and mentioned it also in the book *Miftāḥ Dār al-Sa‘ādah* and others. And when he spoke also in *Ṭarīq al-Hijratayn wa Ṭabaqāt al-Mukallafīn*. Ibn al-Qayyim is creative in his books and in refining the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf*, *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi*. So all these evidences he mentioned and these verses all indicate the falsity of what the *Ash‘āriyyah* claimed of negating Rational Good and Bad.

Then after that he clarified to them that the saying of Allah the Exalted is opposite to their conception. For Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* says in the Qur'an:

وَمَا كُنَّا مُعَذِّبِينَ حَتَّىٰ نَبْعَثَ رَسُولًا

"And We never would punish until We sent a messenger." [QS. Al-Isrā’: 15]

This speech is against the *Mu‘tazilah*; because the *Mu‘tazilah* said that if a human committed something rationally bad, he is punished for it in the Hereafter even if there is no legislative text. This is against the Holy Qur'an. The Qur'an says: (*And We never would punish until We sent a*

messenger). So punishment and legal penalty whether in this world or in the Hereafter is after the Message (*until We sent a messenger*).

I tried to simplify this issue in my book *Dawr Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī fī Takhrīb al-Huwwiyyah al-Islāmiyyah* (The Role of Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī in Destroying Islamic Identity); because he was an Ash'ari, and when he traveled to Paris he was dazzled by this civilization then returned and translated French books for us and placed the first bricks of secularism in the Islamic world. I mentioned that the cause of the problem for him was the subject of Improvement and Detriment. He fell into being an Ash'ari not seeing Rational Improvement and Detriment, and was influenced by the subject of the *Mu'tazilah*, so fell into "how to determine good and bad," so tried to reconcile between them. But he opposed even the creed he was proceeding upon. He wrote his famous book *Takhlīṣ al-Ibrīz fī Talkhīṣ Bārīz*. The Islamic world was surging with Ash'arism since the fourth Hijri century unfortunately. Al-Azhar was the stronghold of this Ash'arism, and Ash'ari books were the ones being taught. They considered Al-Ṭahṭāwī a pyramid of the pyramids of Egypt and the pioneer of modern Egyptian renaissance. The man lived in the period of Muḥammad 'Alī Pasha, died in the year 1290 AH meaning 1873 AD.

The book is named *Dawr Rifā'ah al-Ṭahṭāwī fī Takhrīb al-Huwwiyyah al-Islāmiyyah*. I mentioned the issue of Improvement and Detriment specifically; because what ruined these issues was the *Mu'tazilah*'s spreading of that. We find these Marxists and secularists sanctifying the *Mu'tazilah* because they activated the Mind that it determines good and bad and the Text does not matter. Therefore you find writings saying "Criticism of the Text," meaning criticizing the Text, "Closed-mindedness of the Text," intending by Text the Qur'an and Authentic Sunnah. Because the one who opened this dangerous subject and opened the appetite of these haters of Islam are the *Mu'tazilah* who unleashed the Mind. Although the *Mu'tazilah* in their time intended issues in which there is no text. Therefore you find the *Mu'tazilah*, when there was Mind and Text, they used to interpret, use interpretation and metaphor, unlike the secularists in our days.

They latch onto the *Mu'tazilah*. The *Mu'tazilah* were speaking about if there is no text, the human is held accountable in Improvement and Detriment based on his mind. But if a text was found, they interpret it and prioritize the Mind in this case. This is the problem that happened and the *Ash'āriyyah* were influenced by it. The *Ash'āriyyah* took the issue of Mind and were influenced by the *Mu'tazilah* in the issue of prioritizing Reason over Revelation. Meaning if a text happened saying: (*The Most Merciful rose over the Throne*) [QS. Ṭāhā: 5], (*And your Lord has come and the*

angels, rank upon rank) [QS. Al-Fajr: 22], they interpret it. And interpreting verses of Mercy and others. They prioritize their mind here. This text, either they interpret it or say it is metaphor or delegate it without meaning (*bilā ma‘nā*). But I do not mean delegating modality (*kayfiyyah*), delegating meaning. This [Tafwid of meaning] is the lower degree of *Ash‘āriyyah* in these issues.

So, the *Māturīdiyyah* were better than them in these issues: *Qadar* and the issue of Rational Improvement and Detriment. And also in subsidiary issues I do not like to prolong upon you in them. But he who wants to return, there are books that spoke about the *Māturīdiyyah* and comparison between it and the *Ash‘āriyyah*. They have modern studies and Master's degree studies and others. Good books in their field like the book *Naqd ‘Aqā’id al-Ashā‘irah wa al-Māturīdiyyah* authored by Dr. Khālid ibn ‘Alī al-Marḍī al-Ghāmidī. And in the book *Al-Māturīdiyyah Dirāsah wa Taqyīman* by Aḥmad ibn ‘Awaḍallāh al-Luhaybī al-Ḥarbī, this is a good book also in its field. Naturally he who wants to know in detail and refutations should read the speech of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah whether in the Fatwas and especially the two books *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ* and *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* or in *Dar’ Ta‘āruḍ al-‘Aql wa al-Naql* and in the book *Al-Istiqāmah* and *Al-Radd ‘alā al-Bakrī* and *Al-Ikhnā’iyyah* and others. In very many books, most books of Ibn Taymiyyah, you will find these issues inserted and the refutation of them in some of them. But the books I mentioned to you have, *in shā’ Allāh*, abundant and many benefits in this subject.

Some brothers asked me about the issue of **Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī** and is he and **Al-Nawawī** Ash'aris? Because this is frequently mentioned. Naturally in some studies and some researchers in Master's or PhD study mentioned and investigated these issues. In reality, it does not mean when a person shares or holds an opinion or agrees with an opinion in a specific issue of a certain *Madhhab* that he is from the people of this *Madhhab*. For example, when you declare Takfir on some people who make major sins lawful, for example making fornication lawful. The *Khawārij* declare the perpetrator of a major sin disbeliever. But we speak if you declared a perpetrator of a major sin disbeliever and he was making it lawful, one will say to you "Takfiri" or "Khawarij"! This does not mean when you share with the *Khawārij* in something that you are a Khariji. Meaning when you agree with the *Mu‘tazilah* for example in including actions in the chapter of Faith, meaning the *Mu‘tazilah* and *Khawārij* agree with *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the definition of Faith as speech and action and affirmation by the heart in general, does that mean we say you are a Khariji or Mu'tazili? No, the

Mu'tazili is not except with conditions and five things he believes in; this is the Mu'tazili.

And secondly: I spoke in the previous lecture about the *Mu'tazilah* and their sects and principles and books, and about their most famous scholars. Whoever wants can return to it. It does not mean if you agree with the *Mu'tazilah* in an issue you become a Mu'tazili. Like what? The *Māturīdiyyah* agree with us in the issue of Improvement and Detriment like *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and agree with us in the issue of *Qadar*. Does that mean I am Māturīdī? The *Ash'āriyyah* for example... Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī opposes the *Ash'āriyyah* which latches onto him when he views Highness (*'Uluw*), believes the Most Merciful rose over the Throne, believes as the *Salaf* believe in this issue as in his book *Al-Ibānah* and his book *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* and others. As for those who came after him, almost most of the late ones, this is a pivotal core issue for them; they negate Highness (*Fawqiyyah*) and interpret it, and that (*The Most Merciful rose over the Throne*) means Conquered (*Istawlā*) and does not mean Rose or Ascended without *how*. Does that mean Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī is not an Ash'ari here? No, he is the Imam of the *Ash'āriyyah* and agrees with them in many things. Or that an Ash'ari for example took the opinion of some *Ahl al-Sunnah* in issues, it does not mean he is counted as *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

Imam Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* is among the notables of the ninth Hijri century. The Islamic world since the fourth century, the Ash'ari *Madhhab* was the widespread one. So he was influenced in interpreting some attributes, erred in interpreting them. But Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* himself used to refute the *Ash'āriyyah* and refuted Ibn Fūrak. Although he sometimes used expressions... meaning citing Ibn Fūrak in his book *Al-Tawḥīd* and others, and Al-Juwaynī in some interpretations, but he erred in this. But he is not absolutely an Ash'ari. He erred in specific issues and he is a great Shāfi'ī Imam but not an Ash'ari. And Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī himself refuted many of them and opposed them in issues, like issues of Faith in expelling actions etc. He opposed them even if not completely, in some issues, but he criticized them and criticized the interpretations of Ibn Fūrak and others. And opposed them in the book *Al-Iḥtijāj bi Khabar al-Āḥād fī al-'Aqīdah*. Is he an Ash'ari? While the majority of *Ash'āriyyah* believe that Hadith of *Āḥād* is not used as proof in Creed unless they are *Mutawātir* Hadiths. So he refuted them.

And Imam Al-Nawawī the same matter. He erred in some issues in interpretations in the subject of Attributes and others, and this is what was widespread. It does not mean he believes the Ash'ari creed and is not counted among their Imams. He is added like this due to error in a specific

interpretation in Names and Attributes, but in general he is an Imam of *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

If you spoke about Ibn Ḥajar, then speak about Ibn ‘Aqīl. Speak about Qāḍī Abū Ya‘lā in his book. And this author of the book *Al-Īmān* refuted the *Ash‘āriyyah* and *Mu‘tazilah*, but was influenced in some issues. Ibn Taymiyyah refuted him, and Ibn ‘Aqīl al-Ḥanbalī. Imams of the great Ḥanbalīs. And Imam Ibn al-Jawzī, all these are great Ḥanbalī Imams, and Ibn al-Zāghūnī and others. These were enemies to the *Ash‘āriyyah* and launched wars and books against the *Ash‘āriyyah*, although they agreed with them in some issues. Ibn Taymiyyah refuted them and commented on them although they are his Imams, because Ibn Taymiyyah's *Madhhab* is Ḥanbalī. And despite them being Imams of the Ḥanbalī school, major pillars in the Ḥanbalī school like Qāḍī Abū Ya‘lā and Ibn ‘Aqīl and these others, and he refuted Ibn al-Jawzī. Does anyone say Qāḍī Abū Ya‘lā is an Ash'ari? And Ibn al-Zāghūnī, or Ibn ‘Aqīl, or Ibn al-Jawzī and these others are Ash'aris? No, they were influenced in certain errors they were influenced by, interpreted and erred in them.

Summary:

Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī is not considered an Ash'ari, and is not counted among Ash'ari Imams. He is an Imam of *Ahl al-Sunnah* like Ibn ‘Aqīl and Abū Ya‘lā and Ibn al-Jawzī and these others. But he erred in some issues or agreed with the *Ash‘āriyyah* in such. It does not mean he is an Ash'ari.

Al-Nawawī is an Imam of *Ahl al-Sunnah* but he erred in the issue of such, inclined to this Ash'ari interpretation and erred in it. And Ibn ‘Aqīl likewise. All these we say this about them.

Some issues remained which are specific to the **Reasons for the Spread of Ash'arism**.

Reasons for the spread of *Ash‘āriyyah* and *Māturīdiyyah* in the Islamic world: Most judges were from them. Meaning for example Imam Abū Ḥanīfah in the days of the era of Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd when he appointed Abū Yūsuf in judiciary, Judge of Judges (*Qāḍī al-Quḍāh*), what happened? Abū Yūsuf used to appoint judges who were on his *Madhhab*, Ḥanafīs. Then after that Ḥanafīs were influenced, especially the *Māturīdiyyah*, Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī is originally Ḥanafī. So all their spread in the Abbasid State... they spread abundantly. So what happened as a result of the Judge being Ḥanafī and Judge of Judges being Ḥanafī, appointing Ḥanafīs? And people love to get close and read the opinion of the Judge and be close to this one who belongs to the Caliphate State and

such. Therefore they spread, and the preachers and storytellers were from them, because the Judge used to appoint those on his *Madhhab* at that time. Therefore they spread.

And the *Māturīdiyyah* were present in Transoxiana and in Khorasan and regions which are now Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Iran before it transformed. Iran before that was the stronghold of Ḥanafīs and Shāfi'īs and *Ahl al-Sunnah*. There were no Rāfiḍah like this; they were a minority originally. All names of these cities which were in Khorasan which is Iran now. The Safavid Shiites since two centuries only or three centuries are the ones who changed everything. They were a mixture of Sufism and superstitions. I think this Safavid grandfather founder of the creed of Rāfiḍah transformed and killed the scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

It spread because the Judge of Judges was from them. Most governors used to fear judges and respect them, so the Ash'ari *Madhhab* spread. Because the Ḥanafīs originally believed the *Madhhab* of Imam Abū Ḥanīfah. By the way, Imam Abū Ḥanīfah, I will speak about him in the subject of, *in shā' Allāh*, *Murji'ah* of the Jurists later. Imam Abū Ḥanīfah, whom the *Ash'āriyyah* latch onto today saying "Our Greatest Imam" etc., was originally against them in the issue of Highness. Rather he declares disbelievers those who say Allah is everywhere, or the Most Merciful did not rise over the Throne. He used to say (*The Most Merciful rose over the Throne*) and refuted them and used to rebuke them and ordered expelling them etc. He has a book and a refutation of the *Jahmiyyah* and so on. They say to you: Imam Abū Ḥanīfah was an Ash'ari. O man, Imam Abū Ḥanīfah was an Ash'ari? If Abū Ḥanīfah was born 81 AH approximately or 80, meaning his age was two years or one year in the days of the Battle of Dayr al-Jamājim which was between Ibn al-Ash'ath and Al-Ḥajjāj. And he lived in the two states, end of the Umayyad State and the Abbasid State, lived through two Caliphates and died in the year 150 AH. Al-Ash'arī was not in his mother's womb nor in his father's loins at that time because he is in 260 AH. Meaning he was born after the death of Imam Abū Ḥanīfah by sixty years[17], only. So imagine how he can be an Ash'ari?!

As they said also Imam Al-Bukhārī is an Ash'ari! By Allah, myths and superstitions. One of the youths sent a message to us saying: That Imam Al-Bukhārī was an Ash'ari. The one who wrote *Khalq Af'āl al-'Ibād* and who refuted the *Ash'āriyyah*[18] and refuted the *Jahmiyyah* and refuted all these. Imam Al-Bukhārī lived and was born before Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī was born nor Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī. Meaning this Abū al-Ḥasan

[17] Calculation mismatch, 150 to 260 is 110 years.
[18] Early Kullabiyyah/proto-Ash'arism.

al-Ash‘arī is 260 AH[19], and the other Imam Al-Bukhārī died before the birth of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī by four years[20]. How can he be an Ash'ari? And *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and the books are all against the *Ash‘āriyyah*. And all evidences we use are against them. Rather some extremist Ash'aris reached the point that when you bring him a Hadith in Al-Bukhārī he says to you "This is a Single Report (*Āḥād*)?" And they attacked Al-Bukhārī out of their extremism.

And these Ash'aris like the misguided criminal **Zāhid al-Kawtharī** who lived in the end of the Ottoman State. This one attacked with attacks and many things. Scholars refuted him. The Imam refuted him, as I told you, the Dhahabī of this era, who is Imam Al-Mu‘allimī in his book *Al-Tankīl*. And some refuted this grave-worshipper who attacked the Imams of Islam from the pure centuries to his century, all this in victory for Abū Ḥanīfah only. Rather he used to belittle the Companions and elevate the status of Imam Abū Ḥanīfah. Would that he followed Imam Abū Ḥanīfah or even Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī. Naturally Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī is on the same belief of *Ahl al-Sunnah* and on the belief of Abū Ḥanīfah too, although Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī was Shāfi‘ī and not Ḥanafī.

So, from the reasons for the spread of the Māturīdī and Ash'ari *Madhhab* is the existence of these Sultans and Judges. And also that they appeared in the days of the ‘Ubaydiyyūn and *Fitnahs* and the *Fitnah* of Qarmatians and *Fitnah* of the presence of *Mu‘tazilah* etc. So in this period they were refuting the Jews, Christians, *Mu‘tazilah*, and *Jahmiyyah* and refuting all these sects. Naturally all *Ahl al-Sunnah* and *Ahl al-Ḥadīth* at that time were silent about them by way of mending the rift, and that they are striving, and they are People of Islam, and they defend the Companions, and defend the Caliphs, and they support *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the issue of Imamate and the issue of preference of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, and ‘Alī. And meaning in many things, and refuting all these. So he says to you there is no need to enter with them in debates.

When *Ahl al-Sunnah* were silent about them, unfortunately what happened is they adopted and deceived the Ummah and deceived people in these eras and said they are *Ahl al-Sunnah*, "We are *Ahl al-Sunnah* and we are the ones defending." So they taught people the false creed and errors they fell into and adapted from the *Mu‘tazilah* and others whom they debate and from philosophy books, and said this is in the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

---

[19] Born.

[20] Bukhari died 256 AH, Ash'ari born 260 AH.

This is the great error: silence of the scholars of Sunnah because they believe they are fighting these people and that they are ascetic scholars. Therefore they were silent about them as scholars were silent in the past in the days of the Murābiṭīn State about **Ibn Tūmart**. This imposter who destroyed the Sunni Murābiṭīn State and founded the Muwaḥḥidīn State, and this is an innovated state. He is originally an Ash'ari and counted among Ash'ari scholars. Although in reality this malicious person claimed he is the Mahdī. But he combined three evils together: the worst of what is in the *Ash'āriyyah*, and believed the misguidances of *Mu'tazilah* and *Rāfiḍah*! Imagine combining these evils together. Therefore he permitted and gave fatwa for the permissibility of shedding the blood of Muslims and scholars of Sunnah. Dozens and hundreds of Muslims were killed due to the fatwa of this criminal, and everyone who does not agree with his opinions in creed and *Madhhab*. Then after that he claimed he is the Mahdī then after that they founded the Muwaḥḥidīn State that destroyed the Murābiṭīn State.

Ibn Tūmart, this one died in the year 524 AH. He was claiming Sufism, but he is a mixture of Rāfiḍī Mu'tazili Ash'ari. In the end he caused the killing of scholars. And due to the silence of 'Abdullāh ibn Tāshfīn[21]. When he died, *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi*, his son came and was righteous but not of his father's strength. He appeared in this and people were silent about him claiming he is ascetic and loves *Ahl al-Bayt* and is against innovations and evils. Thus he entered upon people then caused mobilizing people against the State and the Murābiṭid State fell due to this Ash'ari Rāfiḍī Mu'tazili. Everything you imagine, meaning a cocktail of calamities.

So this is from the silence of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in addition to the existence of major institutions. Meaning when you find Al-Zaytuna Mosque, this was protecting Ash'arism including Māturidism. Naturally these Great Mosques which were in Samarkand and Khorasan and others. Muslims were suffering from these Ash'aris even in the state of Niẓām al-Mulk and others, and in the days of his sultanate and days of Sultan Nūr al-Dīn Zankī and days of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī. These metropolises and scientific schools, those responsible for them and scholars appointed by the State and to whom salaries are paid are Ash'aris. So they spread this *Madhhab*.

And also after that the Ottoman State adopted the Ash'ari Māturidism and was Ḥanafī. We told you you hardly find a Mālikī or Shāfi'ī or Ḥanbalī Māturīdī for example, but you can find *Ash'āriyyah* in all schools. The only school in which there is almost nothing except very

[21] Probably 'Alī ibn Yūsuf ibn Tāshfīn.

little is the **Ḥanbalīs**. As for the **Mālikī** school, it was among the purest schools in the past but unfortunately most late ones became Ash'aris too. And the **Shāfi‘iyyah**, there are majestic scholars who used to differentiate between the Ash'ari theologian Shāfi‘ī scholars and Shāfi‘īs who loved Hadith etc. like Ibn ‘Asākir and Al-Bayhaqī. But these Ash'aris in institutions... Al-Azhar basically was a Rāfiḍī institution then turned after that to an institution generally following *Ahl al-Sunnah* but it was teaching the creeds of *Ash‘āriyyah* to our present time.

So all these institutions helped in the spread and dissemination of the *Madhhab* and opinions of the *Ash‘āriyyah*, the Ash'ari and Māturīdī *Madhhab* and their creeds until it became what is taught as the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah*. In addition to the writings or books for which scholars, Pashas, and Beys, and people of charity and endowment (*Waqf*) used to spend money to print these books, and they were Ash'aris too.

So on the opposite side, the correct creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah* did not exist except in a small group. This small group was mostly in the Ḥanbalī school or in some schools like Mālikī and Shāfi‘ī too but not with this strength and did not find who supports it. And scholars faced authority and power from Ḥanafīs and from Ash'aris specifically.

So the Ḥanafī school has now become an Ash'ari *Madhhab* although in reality it is not so. Imam Abū Ḥanīfah is not an Ash'ari and has no relation to Ash'arism at all. Frankly he has a problem in *Irjā’* in the issue of Faith, and we will speak about it later in the definition of Faith, but even Ash'arism appeared and he had died sixty years before Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī appeared.

So this is what happened, the spread of Ash'arism, so it came to be thought that it is the *Madhhab* of the People of Truth and the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah*, and it is the one about which that is said. All that due to all these reasons and others, which facilitated and made people think *Ahl al-Sunnah* are the *Ash‘āriyyah* or *Māturīdiyyah*.

I feel I prolonged, and issues are still with me but no problem, we will postpone some issues, *in shā’ Allāh*. But I wanted only to point to some **famous names among Māturīdī scholars** specifically. Some scholars mentioned Abū al-Qāsim al-Ṣaffār, died 336 AH, has book *Uṣūl al-Tawḥīd*. And the famous Imam Abū al-Layth al-Samarqandī, also author of book *Baḥr al-‘Ulūm*, died year 375; this is an Imam among the great Māturīdī Imams.

And also the author of a book in *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* and *Uṣūl al-Dīn*, Imam Ṣadr al-Islām al-Bazdawī died year 493 AH. Abū al-Mu'īn al-Nasafī died 508 AH, has book *Al-Tamhīd* and *Tafṣīl al-Adillah* and others. Also Al-Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī died year 654 AH, has book *Al-Nafīs fī Masā'il al-Tawḥīd*. Also Abū al-Faḍā'il Burhān al-Dīn al-Nasafī, has book taught *'Aqā'id al-Dīn al-Nasafiyyah*, died year 687 AH. And there is also Akmal al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Bābartī, a very great Imam and he is also Ḥanafī Māturīdī, died year 786 AH, has *Al-'Aqīdah fī al-Tawḥīd*. Also there is 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Bukhārī, this came after the days of Ibn Taymiyyah and has a poem in which he declared Ibn Taymiyyah disbeliever, and he died year 741[22]. One of the great scholars Naṣr al-Dīn refuted him in a beautiful poem printed now refuting the *Mujassimah*[23]. He accused Ibn Taymiyyah of *Tajsīm* and declared him disbeliever, this 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Bukhārī died year 841 AH, and was a staunch Māturīdī.

And Kamāl al-Dīn ibn al-Humām the famous, this one died year 861 AH, author of, if you hear of it, *Fatḥ al-Qadīr*, has book *Al-Musāyarah fī al-'Aqā'id*. From the aspect of creedal books these are big Imams among them. There is naturally the great historian Al-Kāfiyajī[24], he is Māturīdī too among great historians and has a book in *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif wa al-Anwār*, he died year 873 AH. And a big scholar among their luminaries is Zayn al-Dīn ibn Qāsim Quṭlūbughā, died 879 AH, an Imam among their Imams. Also Ibn Kamāl Bāshā died 940 AH and has a book in *Sharḥ al-Tajrīd* and others in *'Ilm al-Kalām*. And Mullā 'Alī al-Qārī died year 1014 AH, and he is a *Muḥaddith*, big scholar and virtuous too, and he is from the *Māturīdiyyah*.

And also some contemporary scholars, **Muḥammad Anwar Shāh al-Kashmīrī**, the famous *Muḥaddith* in India, has a book in explanation of *Al-Bukhārī* and others, and some books. But frankly there is extremism, meaning this was Māturīdī. This one whom Sheikh **'Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah** and others glorify greatly. Always any biographies of Sheikh Abū Ghuddah, know that they contain exaggeration... and nonsense and refutations and fanaticism for Ḥanafīs and *Ash'āriyyah*, and always insinuation and aspersion against Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah. Meaning extremists. So even when they speak about their scholars... the edits of Sheikh 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah, I mean his opinions specifically, be wary of them because he is Ash'ari and defends grave-

[22] Text says 741 then later 841. Correct is 841 AH.
[23] Refuting his accusation of Tajsim.
[24] Likely Al-Kāfiyajī or similar.

worshippers and has extremism although it is said he is from scholars of Hadith.

All these scholars have praiseworthy traits and goodness and most of them are great majestic scholars, except this man the great calamity and biggest misguidance: **Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawtharī**. This is among the biggest misguided ones who misguided the scholars of the Ummah and insulted, cursed, abused, distorted, and lied. The great scholar Al-Mu‘allimī refuted him in his book *Al-Tankīl*. This man died in the year 1371 AH. Also among the famous is Ḥājjī Khalīfah author of book *Kashf al-Ẓunūn*, this is Māturīdī too died year 1067 AH.

This is a sample, meaning very many scholars. Because the Ottoman State remained about six centuries and adopted the Ḥanafī Māturīdī *Madhhab*. Meaning they were Ḥanafī Māturīdīs. Māturīdīs means they are Ash'aris, and when I say Ash'aris it means they are Māturīdīs. Therefore you must be cautious in some issues only which are the difference between them in the issues I told you.

But the **major figures of the Ash‘āriyyah**, as I told you before, Imam Al-Bāqillānī, Al-Bayhaqī died year 458 AH, and Abū Qāsim al-Qushayrī 465 AH, this one caused a very big *Fitnah* in his time for some *Ahl al-Sunnah* and Ḥanbalīs. And Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī was also Ash'ari although Shāfi‘ī too. And Ibn Tūmart. And Imam Al-Māzarī was also Ash'ari and has a book explaining *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (*Al-Mu‘lim bi Fawā’id Muslim*) and others. And Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī is among the great Imams.

They were against people of innovation, and have many good deeds, especially Al-Māzarī and Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī. But Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī has things and eccentricities, *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi*, author of *Al-Aḥkām*. Some scholars refuted him. But he has the book *‘Āriḍat al-Aḥwadhī*, very wonderful in explaining *Al-Tirmidhī*, and *Qānūn al-Ta’wīl*.

Also Al-Shahrastānī was Ash'ari, and some accused him of being Shiite. And Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ‘Asākir died 571 AH, also a known scholar, was not an extremist but from the Ash'ari theologians, and was among the *Muḥaddithīn* but unfortunately interpreted the issue of (*The Most Merciful rose over the Throne*) and inclined to the opinion of *Ash‘āriyyah* in this. And Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī died 606 was also a philosopher theologian then after that it was said he repented in the end of his life. And Al-Āmidī died year 631 AH, this is among the intelligent scholars of theirs and is considered very dangerous, and did not fall into much contradiction as Al-Rāzī and Al-Armawī fell, and he died year 662 AH. And ‘Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī whom I spoke about in the past lecture when I said Al-Ījī died 756 AH,

has a book named *Al-Mawāqif* defending the Ash'ari creed; this is the one who was contemporary to Imam Ibn Taymiyyah.

And naturally there are very majestic scholars influenced by Ash'arism although they are people of goodness and righteousness and not from the poles of *Ash'āriyyah*, in the sense that they had books and defend... but fell into some errors. Like **Ibn al-Ḥājib** the great Mujtahid Māliki died 646 AH. And Imam **Al-'Izz ibn 'Abd al-Salām**, the famous Sultan of Scholars, the great Mujtahid, had Ash'arism in some issues, died 660 AH.

And Imam **Al-Bayḍāwī** author of the *Tafsir* 685 AH. And **Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Hindī**, this one was among the fiercest enemies of Ibn Taymiyyah, was very severe against Ibn Taymiyyah, died year 735 AH. Also great Imams and judges having very great merit but fell into some errors like Qāḍī **Badr al-Dīn ibn Jamā'ah** died 793 AH, also inclined to some Ash'arism in Names and Attributes. **Al-Subkī** author of *Al-Ṭabaqāt*, Al-Subkī the Elder and Al-Subkī the Younger, meaning the son and father, Tāj al-Dīn and Taqī al-Dīn. And Imam **Al-Isnawī** died 881 AH. And after that we have also **Al-Maqqarī al-Tilmisānī**, **Al-Dardīrī**, **Al-Dasūqī**, and **Ibrāhīm al-Bājūrī** who died 1277 AH. And the misguided criminal **'Abdullāh al-Ḥabashī** the Ash'ari who was in Lebanon.

And there are Imams also influenced like Imam **Al-Suyūṭī** and others. We speak about the great Imams among them who have books and defenses. As for those who were influenced, do not believe that he is Ash'ari in the sense that he is Ash'ari in his principles and branches etc. No, they were influenced in some issues especially in issues of Names and Attributes.

We suffice with this amount. And, *in shā' Allāh*, in the **Eighth Lesson** we speak about some issues I mentioned to you, the subject of **Exception in Faith**, and **Faith Increases and Decreases**, and I answer some other doubts.

We ask Allah the Great, Lord of the Great Throne, to encompass us in His mercy. I say this saying of mine and seek forgiveness from Allah for me and for you. And may Allah bless you. And may He reward you with all good.

And I hope from every brother to try to listen to these lectures a good listening. I know they are heavy on the soul. If you want, put them in the focus of consciousness and do not put them in the margin of consciousness. Meaning if you want to listen from the computer or listen from MP3, concentrate on it and do not turn to what is around you. Make

the articles and your search on the Internet etc. on the margin of consciousness because if you made it [the lecture] in the margin of consciousness, believe me you will not benefit much. You must concentrate well, and sip something hot and good or cold to listen and benefit, *in shā' Allāh*, and write some points and try to print this and copy it and distribute it to the largest amount possible. Because these are not lectures for the elite only, we want to spread them to students of knowledge especially beginners and some people who do not know. If you know, then good and blessing, but spread this knowledge, for perhaps a recipient understands more than a listener.

May Allah bless you, and we ask Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* to make these words of ours purely for His Noble Face.

Wa al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh..

The Eighth Lesson

Increase and Decrease of Faith:

Verily, all praise is due to Allah; we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allah from the evils of our souls and our bad deeds. Whomever Allah guides, there is no one to misguide him, and whomever He leads astray, there is no guide for him. I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, alone with no partner, and that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ تُقَاتِهِ وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُم مُّسْلِمُونَ

"O you who have believed, fear Allah as He should be feared and do not die except as Muslims." [QS. Āl 'Imrān: 102]

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُم مِّن نَّفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا وَبَثَّ مِنْهُمَا رِجَالًا كَثِيرًا وَنِسَاءً ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا

"O mankind, fear your Lord, who created you from one soul and created from it its mate and dispersed from both of them many men and women. And fear Allah, through whom you ask one another, and the wombs. Indeed Allah is ever, over you, an Observer." [QS. An-Nisā': 1]

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَقُولُوا قَوْلًا سَدِيدًا * يُصْلِحْ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ ۗ وَمَن يُطِعِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيمًا

"O you who have believed, fear Allah and speak words of appropriate justice. He will [then] amend for you your deeds and forgive you your sins. And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has certainly attained a great attainment." [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 70-71]

To proceed: The most truthful speech is the Book of Allah, and the best guidance is the guidance of Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*. And the worst of matters are their innovations, and every innovation is a heresy (*bid'ah*), and every heresy is a misguidance, and every misguidance is in the Fire.

Honored brothers, here we are on the eighth day of the month of Muḥarram of the year 1433 AH. We are also with the **Eighth Lesson** of this Sharia course, whose title we chose to be: *Masā'il fī al-Īmān* (Issues Regarding Faith).

Today the lecture will be about **The Increase and Decrease of Faith**. We also speak about another issue which is a subject of the subjects of dispute regarding the appellation of Faith among the sects, which is: The issue of **Exception (*Istithnā'*)**, meaning that a believer says: "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh* (if Allah wills)." If there is ample time; if not, I will postpone it to a coming lesson, *in shā' Allāh*.

Now we will speak about the **Fruit of the Dispute**, or the effect that resulted from the difference regarding the appellation of Faith. In the beginning, the principle upon which these sects that differed with *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the issue of Faith were established is, as we told you in previous lessons, that they considered Faith to be a single thing that **cannot be partitioned nor divided**, and that part of it does not go while part of it remains. But according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*, this is not necessarily so. Faith can be partitioned, and a man might have some immorality (*fisq*), some hypocrisy, some disbelief, or a trait of this, yet he is a believer due to his faith and immoral or disobedient due to his major sin.

But they considered Faith a single block. Thus, among the effects of that is that they differed. The **Jahmiyyah** said it is Knowledge (*Ma'rifah*) only, and they do not hold with the increase and decrease of Faith, nor do they hold with Exception in Faith. They have expelled actions and even sayings from the definition of Faith. For them, it is Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*) and Heart Belief (*I'tiqād Qalbī*) only, without actions or sayings.

And those who said that Faith is Affirmation by the heart and Speech by the tongue and expelled actions, said that Faith does not increase nor decrease. They clashed with the Sharia texts that spoke about the increase of Faith in the Holy Qur'an. They say if there was increase and decrease, then there is doubt. They consider the faith of Jibrīl *'alayhis salām* and the faith of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* and the faith of Abū Bakr *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* and the faith of one of the immoral people (*fussāq*) to be one! Thus, in this case, Faith is constant, neither increasing nor decreasing.

They clashed with clear Qur'anic texts. How do they reconcile between these texts that spoke about the increase and decrease of Faith, such as His saying, the Exalted:

الَّذِينَ قَالَ لَهُمُ النَّاسُ إِنَّ النَّاسَ قَدْ جَمَعُوا لَكُمْ فَاخْشَوْهُمْ فَزَادَهُمْ إِيمَانًا وَقَالُوا حَسْبُنَا اللَّهُ وَنِعْمَ الْوَكِيلُ

"Those to whom hypocrites said, 'Indeed, the people have gathered against you, so fear them.' But it [merely] increased them in faith; and they said, 'Sufficient for us is Allah, and [He is] the best Disposer of affairs.'" [QS. Āl ʻImrān: 173]

And His saying, the Exalted:

لِيَزْدَادُوا إِيمَانًا مَّعَ إِيمَانِهِمْ

"That they would increase in faith along with their [present] faith." [QS. Al-Fatḥ: 4]?!

And many evidences were reviewed by scholars, like the great *Ḥāfiẓ* Abū ʻUbaydillāh al-Qāsim ibn Sallām, who died in the year 224 AH[25], in his book *Al-Īmān* when he refuted those who said Faith does not increase nor decrease. How do they object to His saying, the Exalted: (*Those to whom hypocrites said... But it [merely] increased them in faith*) in Sūrah Āl ʻImrān verse 173? And His saying: (*That the people of the Scripture may reach certainty and those who have believed may increase in faith*) [QS. Al-Muddaththir: 31]? And His saying: (*That they would increase in faith along with their [present] faith*) as in Sūrah Al-Fatḥ, and many places in the Holy Qur'an. These are clear texts with no ambiguity.

Therefore, he argued against them also when he mentioned the **Chapter of Increase in Faith and Decrease from it** in his book. He cited with his chain from Jāmiʻ ibn Shaddād from Al-Aswad ibn Hilāl who said: Muʻādh ibn Jabal said: "**Sit with us, let us believe for an hour**," meaning let us remember Allah. Its chain is authentic according to the conditions of the Two Sheikhs (Bukhari and Muslim). Imam Abū Bakr ibn Abī Shaybah relied on this Hadith, and he died in the year 235 AH, and refuted these doubts and the contradiction into which they fell.

So they interpreted them with interpretations, avoiding Takfir [of the verses], and said: The meaning here is "increases in faith" means "increases in certainty (*yaqīn*)," for Faith according to them is certainty above certainty. Or that the origin of Faith is the establishment of Acknowledgment (*Iqrār*) in the heart. All this because they do not acknowledge that actions like prayer and zakat and actions of the hearts are from the definition of Faith. Therefore they fell into these contradictions.

[25] Text says 154 AH, correct date is 224 AH.

He refuted them even with refutations closer to rational refutations. If a man's wealth was described as being a thousand, then it was said it increased by a hundred after that, it would have no meaning understood by people except that the hundred is additional to the thousand. Likewise are all other things. Faith is like them; nothing increases from it unless it is additional to Faith. As for them, they did not say this increase, in this way, but made it metaphorical. As for those who made the increase "increase of certainty," it has no meaning for them. Because certainty is from Faith. If Faith according to them entirely is Acknowledgment, then these acknowledgers completed their acknowledgment, have they not encompassed it with certainty from their saying? How does something increase that has been fully attained and encompassed?!

He struck an example for them: What do you think of a man who looked at the day in the forenoon until he encompassed it entirely with its light, could he increase in certainty that it is day? Even if mankind and jinn gathered against him? This is impossible. All this so they expel Action from the definition of Faith. So they fell into contradiction and clashed with texts and interpreted them with erroneous interpretations. Scholars refuted them and debunked them, like Imam Ibn Sallām *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi*.

Despite that, they have the text of *Al-‘Aqīdah al-Nasafiyyah*, which is an Ash'ari creed spread in the world. And *Ash‘āriyyah* is approximately *Māturīdiyyah*, but I will differentiate between them in issues like the issue of increase and decrease of Faith. Because they differed; the *Ash‘āriyyah* do not have a unified opinion on this issue. The majority of *Ash‘āriyyah* hold that it increases and decreases. According to *Māturīdiyyah* and some *Ash‘āriyyah*, it does not increase nor decrease. This is naturally a false *Madhhab*, which is the *Madhhab* of the *Murji'ah* and *Jahmiyyah*. But their reason for increase and decrease differs from *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and their justifications... this issue I will say later.

In *Al-‘Aqīdah al-Nasafiyyah* by ‘Umar ibn Muḥammad al-Nasafī, and this is a book taught and explained with large commentaries, and he died in the year 537 AH, he says in the text itself: "**Faith in the Sharia is Affirmation of what the Prophet *‘alayhi al-ṣalātu wa al-salām* brought from Allah the Exalted, and Acknowledgment of it. As for Actions, they increase in themselves, but Faith does not increase nor decrease.**" Thus they acknowledge that the increase of actions is far from the definition of Faith itself. So if there is one who gives zakat and another who does not give zakat, the one who gives zakat increases [in deeds] and the one who does not give zakat does not increase, or he who has more threshold (*niṣāb*) gives more zakat so he increases.

Therefore he says in the text quite frankly: "**Faith does not increase nor decrease.** And Islam is one. If Affirmation and Acknowledgment are found from the servant, it is correct for him to say 'I am a believer truly' and he should not say '*In shā' Allāh*'." The witness here is that Faith does not increase nor decrease and they acknowledge that even in contemporary texts, and even in the text of *Jawharat al-Tawḥīd*.

And the *Khawārij* agree with *Ahl al-Sunnah* in including Actions in Faith. Do they say Faith increases and decreases? The *Khawārij* consider Faith a single block. It is famous among them that they acknowledge increase but do not acknowledge decrease; because [if it decreases] he disbelieves. And some of them do not acknowledge increase nor decrease. Even the *Khawārij* fell into this because they considered Faith a single block that cannot be partitioned; either you take it all or leave it all.

Even the *Jahmiyyah* and *Murji'ah*, it is not partitioned for them. It is Affirmation and Heart Acknowledgment. Even those who said Acknowledgment by the Tongue. The principle is that increase and decrease are not permissible in this except by way of metaphor, or way of certainty, or that whenever a human contemplates more he knows evidences, and increases in certainty upon certainty. And they inferred by the saying of Allah the Exalted:

قَالَ أَوَلَمْ تُؤْمِنْ ۖ قَالَ بَلَىٰ وَلَٰكِن لِّيَطْمَئِنَّ قَلْبِي

"He said, 'Have you not believed?' He said, 'Yes, but [I ask] only that my heart may be satisfied.'" [QS. Al-Baqarah: 260]

This is the saying of Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* to our master Ibrāhīm *'alayhis salām*. So they said its meaning is for increase of certainty. But the texts shocked them greatly, for scholars showered them with numerous and very many evidences.

In addition to the Hadiths as in the Hadith of Bukhari and Muslim, which is the Hadith ("Faith is sixty-some or seventy-some branches, the lowest of them is removing harm from the path, and modesty (*Ḥayā'*) is a branch of Faith"). Thus Faith consists of branches (*Shu'ab*), so it increases and decreases. Imam Al-Ḥāfiẓ Al-Bayhaqī has a book *Shu'ab al-Īmān*, a huge book of several volumes, explaining these branches of Faith. He gathered Hadiths speaking about branches of Faith, gathering many of these branches. So Faith is partitioned. I read to you so we recognize how scholars formulated the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*, very briefly, with conciseness in expression and brevity in meaning.

Even the great *Ḥāfiẓ* Imam Muḥammad al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Khalaf al-Barbahārī has a book named *Sharḥ al-Sunnah*, died in the year 329 AH. He was severe against people of innovation. He says on the subject of Faith: "**And Faith is that Faith is Speech, Action, Intention, and Correctness (*Iṣābah*). It increases and decreases. It increases to what Allah wills and decreases until nothing remains of it.**" He is refuting the *Jahmiyyah* and *Murji'ah* and some *Ash‘āriyyah* when they appeared in his time.

And Imam Al-Saffārīnī recorded the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah* in a poetic text when he said: *Our Faith is Speech, Intent, and Action... It is increased by Piety and decreased by slip (sin). And we, in our Faith, make exception from... Without doubt; so listen and clarify.*

I mentioned to you that the *Salaf* sometimes used to say: "Our Faith is Speech, Intent, and Action." And sometimes: "Faith is Belief by the heart (*janān*), Speech by the tongue, Action by the pillars (*arkān*), and Following the Sunnah." I spoke about the refutation of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, and that there are no contradictions in it, they all intend precaution by it.

Among the best people who explained to us the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and clarified and refuted very briefly, is Imam Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī in his book *Al-Tabṣīr fī Ma‘ālim al-Dīn*, and his book *Ṣarīḥ al-Sunnah*. He died in the year 310 AH.

I mentioned to you his article: "As for the saying regarding Faith: Is it Speech and Action? And does it increase and decrease? Or is there no increase in it nor decrease? The correct view in it is: The saying of whoever said it is **Speech and Action and Increases and Decreases**. The report came regarding it from a group from the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, and upon it the people of religion and virtue proceeded. Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Shaqīq narrated to us saying: Abū ‘Abdillāh Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal *raḥimahullāhu* [was asked] about Faith, regarding the meaning of Faith concerning increase and decrease. He said: Al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā al-Ashyab narrated to us, Ḥammād ibn Salamah al-Khaṭafī narrated to us from his father from his grandfather ‘Umayr ibn Ḥabīb who said: Faith increases and decreases. It was said: What is its increase and what is its decrease? He said: If we mention Allah and praise Him and glorify Him, that is its increase. And if we become heedless and waste and forget, that is its decrease." This is his speech in *Ṣarīḥ al-Sunnah*.

As for his speech in *Al-Tabṣīr fī Ma‘ālim al-Dīn*, he discussed the differences of sects. In the Sixth Difference Abū Ja‘far said: "That is the difference regarding the increase of Faith and its decrease. For Faith

increases and decreases, and its increase is by obedience, and its decrease is by disobedience." And he said: "They said increase and decrease are only permissible regarding it because it is Knowledge, Speech, and Action. People vary in actions; so the most abundant of them in obedience is the most abundant of them in faith, and the least of them in obedience is the least of them in faith." This is the opinion of *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

"And others said it increases but does not decrease, and this is the opinion of the *Mu'tazilah*, *Ibāḍiyyah*, and some *Khawārij*." After he discussed the other opinion which is: Faith does not increase nor decrease, which is the saying of the *Murji'ah*, like the *Jahmiyyah*, these sects saying Faith is Heart Knowledge only. They said Faith is knowledge of Allah and His Tawhid and Acknowledgment of that, after knowledge, and what He obligated upon him of obligations. They said so it does not increase nor decrease. And ignorance of that and denial of any part of it is *Kufr*, so there is no way for increase. In what would it be Faith except in its completeness?

So Faith does not exist unless you believe and acknowledge the knowledge of Allah and His Tawhid. So how do you say it increases? While one is not a believer except with this. Nor decrease; in what is the decrease from it? It is *Kufr*! Because they restricted themselves and Faith to Heart Knowledge only. This is the error with them. So they said the saying of the speaker "Faith increases and decreases" is *Kufr* and ignorance. They declare those who say that disbelievers.

We profess actions of the hearts. Meaning "their hearts tremble" (*wajilat qulūbuhum*), meaning they feared. (*Has the time not come for those who have believed that their hearts should become humble to the remembrance of Allah*) [QS. Al-Ḥadīd: 16]. Thus, whenever you read the Qur'an and remember, you cry and are affected, you increase in humility (*khushū'*). This differs from the one who does not cry and is not affected. There is variation among people even in this. One increases in faith when he hears the verses of Allah or some admonitions, so his humility increases, and he acts here. This is action, and Faith rises.

Abū Ja'far al-Ṭabarī said: "The Truth in that according to us is that it is said Faith increases and decreases, due to what we described before that it is Knowledge, Speech, and Action. And that all obligations of Allah, exalted is His mention, which He obligated upon His servants are among the meanings by which the servant does not deserve the name 'Believer' except by performing them. If that is so, and there is no doubt that people vary in actions; a negligent one, another moderate (*muqtaṣid*), and a striver (*mujtahid*), and one who is more striving than him. It is known that the negligent is less in faith than the moderate, and the moderate is more in

faith than him, and the striver is more in faith than the moderate and the negligent, and they are less in faith than him.

And every worker falls short of perfection. So there is no one except he is deficient in faith, not perfect. If it were perfected for one of them completely such that testifying to it was permissible for him, testifying Paradise for him would be permissible. Because whoever performed all obligations of Allah leaving nothing of them, and avoided all His prohibitions committing nothing of them, then died upon that; there is no doubt that he is from the people of Paradise, because he did all acts of obedience and avoided all acts of disobedience and died. Therefore ‘Abdullāh ibn Mas‘ūd said regarding the one about whom it was said to him that he said 'I am a believer': 'Did he not say I am from the people of Paradise?'" He is refuting here the issue of Exception in Faith.

So Imam Ibn Jarīr clarifies for us here the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah*. Naturally this paragraph we will need later in the issue of Exception in Faith. Imam Al-Ṭabarī, died 310 AH, also refuted this subject.

Why do I repeat and mention these texts? Because, unfortunately, there is negligence among some attributed to people of knowledge. Some people do not mention these many texts and names of books. Because the books of *Ash‘āriyyah* and *Murji'ah* are very many, and names of scholars. When one of them brings out names of scholars, terror strikes you from their abundance, and it crosses your mind "Where are *Ahl al-Sunnah*?!"

You mention to us only Imam Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Taymiyyah or Sheikh Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb and the matter ends. We mention to you many scholars. These are books printed recently, and the speech is now available, and there are manuscripts of these books. Scholars mentioned them, and we mention to you names of scholars as examples.

We have not yet read, for example, the speech of **Imam Al-Lālakā’ī** died 418 AH in his book *Mu‘taqad Ahl al-Sunnah*. He refuted these sects and cited with his chain detailed evidences from the Qur'an and Sunnah and Companions and Successors and so on. If I kept citing these evidences and citations, we would be confused for tens of hours just to finish this.

Why do we detail and increase in these subjects and perhaps I repeat some sentences? So the listener and recipient is reassured that the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah* is a firm creed, an authentic creed, a pure creed, correct with no ambiguity, from the Book of Allah and His Sunnah, and from great

trustworthy Imams who carried this religion for us, of rulings, creeds, details, and legislations.

For example, Imam Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū ʻAbdillāh ibn Baṭṭah died 387 AH, I told you about him previously, and I repeat names of these scholars intentionally so they are memorized. People memorize names of actors and artists and the vilest of humans; why not repeat such names! He who loves a person loves to repeat his name. He who is infatuated with these celebrities loves to repeat their names anytime. We mention the names of the People of Truth because we are discussing Truth now, and debunking the doubts of these falsifiers from the *Murji'ah*, and trying to distinguish between the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʻah* and this smoke and impurities which some thought were from the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʻah*.

Imam Abū ʻAbdillāh ibn Baṭṭah says for example: "**The first thing we begin mentioning of that is mentioning what Allah *ʻAzza wa Jalla* obligated upon His servants, and sent His Messenger *ṣallallāhu ʻalayhi wa sallam* regarding, and revealed in His Book; which is Faith in Allah *ʻAzza wa Jalla*.**"

This is contrary to the speech of the *Ashʻāriyyah*. For example in the text of *ʻAqīdat Umm al-Barāhīn* by Abū ʻAbdillāh ibn Muḥammad al-Sanūsī, who is from the Māliki scholars in Morocco, and it is a creed from the creeds of *Ashʻāriyyah* and *Murji'ah*, died 895 AH. He says: "Praise be to Allah and prayers and peace upon the Messenger of Allah. Know that the Rational Judgment is restricted to three divisions: Necessity (*Wujūb*), Impossibility (*Istiḥālah*), and Possibility (*Jawāz*). The Necessary is that whose non-existence is not conceived in the mind. The Impossible is that whose existence is not conceived in the mind. The Possible is that whose existence and non-existence are valid in the mind. It is obligatory upon every responsible person (*Mukallaf*) to know what is necessary regarding the right of our Master *Jalla wa ʻAzza* and what is impossible and what is possible. Likewise he must know the like of that regarding the right of the Messengers *ʻalayhim al-ṣalātu wa al-salām*.

And among what is necessary for our Master *ʻAzza wa Jalla* are twenty attributes, namely: Existence, Beginninglessness (*Qidam*), His difference from originated things (*Ḥawādith*), His subsisting by Himself, meaning not needing a locus nor a specifier, Oneness (*Waḥdāniyyah*), meaning no second to Him in His attributes nor His actions. These six attributes; the first is Essential (*Nafsiyyah*) which is Existence, and the five after it are Negating (*Salbiyyah*).

And seven attributes are necessary for Him called Attributes of Meanings (*Ma'ānī*), namely: Power, Will related to all possibilities, Knowledge related to all necessities, possibilities, and impossibilities, Life which relates to nothing, Hearing and Sight which relate to all existents, and Speech which is without letter or sound and Knowledge relates to it regarding attachments.

Then seven attributes called Abstract Attributes (*Ma'nawiyyah*) which are related to the first seven: His being Powerful, Willing, Knowing, Living, Hearing, Seeing, and Speaking.

And twenty attributes are impossible regarding His right, which are the opposites of the first twenty: Non-existence, Origination (*Ḥudūth*), Occurrence of non-existence, Resemblance; or that He be a body (*Jirm*) meaning His High Essence taking an amount of vacuum, or be an Accident (*'Araḍ*) subsisting in a body, or be in a direction for the body, or have a direction, or be restricted in place or time, or His High Essence be described with needs..."

You feel your heart disgusted when you hear this speech! And you make people hate the simplification of Creed. Unfortunately they were and still are teaching boys these texts, dark!

When you compare that with the simple, easy, beautiful speech of Imam Abū 'Abdillāh ibn Baṭṭah... The scholar Al-Sanūsī author of *Umm al-Barāhīn* died 895 AH. And Ibn Baṭṭah the great *Ḥāfiẓ* died 387 AH. And I mentioned to you Imam Abū Bakr ibn Abī Shaybah who died 235 AH. And Imam Abū al-Qāsim ibn Sallām who died 224 AH. He mentions with all simplicity and ease and enters into Hadiths.

He says: "The first thing we begin mentioning of that is mentioning what Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* obligated upon His servants, and sent His Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* regarding, and revealed in His Book; which is Faith in Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*. And its meaning is Affirmation of what He said and commanded and obligated, and forbade, of everything the Messengers brought from Allah, and the Books were revealed with. Therefore He sent Messengers. Therefore Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* said: (*And We sent not before you any messenger except that We revealed to him that, "There is no deity except Me, so worship Me."*) [QS. Al-Anbiyā': 25]. And Affirmation of that is Speech by the Tongue, Affirmation by the Heart, and Action by the Pillars. Abundance of action and speech with excellence increases it. Disobedience decreases it. It has a beginning and start, and ascent and increase without end. Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* said: (*Those to whom hypocrites said, "Indeed, the people have gathered against you, so fear them." But it [merely] increased them in*

faith) [QS. Āl ʻImrān: 173]. And He said: (*And that those who have believed will increase in faith*) [QS. Al-Muddaththir: 31]. And He said: (*That they would increase in faith along with their [present] faith*) [QS. Al-Fatḥ: 4]. And Muʻādh ibn Jabal said to a man: ('Sit with us, let us believe for an hour'), meaning we remember Allah so we increase in faith. And everything that increases, decreases. And Exception in Faith is that a person says: 'I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*'." Then he mentions the opinions of scholars.

There is a campaign now from some youths or some Ash'aris, some youths might have sent them some previous lessons, there is a fierce campaign on the website or on me personally. They say "You are unfair," and "This is the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah*," and "These Imams Abū Ḥanīfah, Imam Mālik, Imam Aḥmad, all whom you mention except Imam Aḥmad are Ash'aris, and this is their creed, the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah*." *Aʻūdhu billāh*!

Look at what Imam Ibn Baṭṭah *raḥmatullāhi ʻalayhi* was saying. He was saying Faith increases and decreases and the issue of Exception in Faith. While the *Ashʻāriyyah* do not say that, as I read to you Al-Nasafī regarding that, when he said: "He should not say I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*," and also said: "Faith does not increase nor decrease."

This was said by ʻAbdullāh ibn Masʻūd, and the scholars after him adopted it like: ʻAlqamah, Al-Aswad ibn Abī Wā'il, Mughīrah, Masrūq, Manṣūr, Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaʻī, Al-Aʻmash, Ḥammād ibn Zayd, Yazīd ibn Zurayʻ, Bishr ibn al-Mufaḍḍal, Muʻādh ibn Muʻādh, Sufyān ibn Ḥabīb, Al-Thawrī, Ibn al-Mubārak, Al-Fuḍayl ibn ʻIyāḍ, in a group; listing them would lengthen the book. This is the speech of Imam Ibn Baṭṭah, mentioning scholars up to his era, and he died 387 AH.

So what about those who came after him, like Imam Al-Lālakā'ī, who died 418 AH? He also mentioned to us names of a very large group. Then we reached the great Imams who mentioned to us up to the era of Ibn Taymiyyah in his two books *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* and *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ*. For example: Imam Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned in his book *Matn al-ʻAqīdah al-Wāsiṭiyyah*, a simple text for a youth wanting to know the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʻah* in specific issues, not all issues, he mentioned quickly: "**From the principles of the People of the Community (*Ahl al-Jamāʻah*) is that Religion and Faith are Speech and Action; Speech of the heart and tongue, and Action of the heart, tongue, and limbs.**"

Look at Ibn Taymiyyah's expressions, of utmost precision, *raḥmatullāhi ʻalayhi*. I ask Allah *Subḥānahu wa Taʻālā* to increase him in

rank upon the rank Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla* prepared for him in Al-Firdaws Al-A‘lā, *in shā’ Allāh*.

Many nations were guided by the grace of Allah the Exalted after reading the books of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah and his students. I personally could not understand these issues except after entering into the books of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah. Then after that these books [of Salaf] were printed later. Because a person was able to know these details and refutations *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi* therefore you find this fierce onslaught against him because Allah increases him in good deeds and elevation, *in shā’ Allāh*.

Therefore he says: "**From the principles of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah* is that Religion and Faith are Speech and Action; Speech of the heart and tongue and Action of the heart, tongue, and limbs. And that Faith increases with obedience and decreases with disobedience. Along with that, they do not declare the People of the Qiblah disbelievers due to absolute sins and major sins, as the *Khawārij* do. Rather, brotherhood of Faith is established with sins.** As He, the Exalted, said in the verse of Retribution (*Qiṣāṣ*): (*But if any remission is made to anyone by his brother, then grant any reasonable demand*) [QS. Al-Baqarah: 178]. And His saying, the Exalted: (*And if two factions among the believers fight, then make settlement between the two. But if one of them oppresses the other, then fight against the one that oppresses until it returns to the ordinance of Allah. And if it returns, then make settlement between them in justice and act justly. Indeed, Allah loves those who act justly. The believers are but brothers, so make settlement between your brothers. And fear Allah that you may receive mercy.*) [QS. Al-Ḥujurāt: 9-10]. **Nor do they strip Islam totally from the immoral person (*Fāsiq*) of the Millah, nor do they keep him eternally in the Fire as the *Mu‘tazilah* do. Rather the *Fāsiq* enters into the name of Absolute Faith (*Muṭlaq al-Īmān*),** as in His saying the Exalted: (*Then the freeing of a believing slave*) [QS. Al-Nisā’: 92]. **And he might not enter into the Absolute [Complete] Faith (*Īmān Muṭlaq*)** as in His saying the Exalted: (*The believers are only those who, when Allah is mentioned, their hearts become fearful, and when His verses are recited to them, it increases them in faith*) [QS. Al-Anfāl: 2]. And the saying of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*: ('The fornicator does not fornicate while he is a believer, nor does the thief steal while he is a believer, nor does he drink alcohol when he drinks it while he is a believer, nor does he plunder a plunder of value while people raise their eyes to him when he plunders it while he is a believer'). We say: He is a believer deficient in faith, or he is a believer by his faith and immoral (*fāsiq*)

by his major sin. So he is not given the absolute name [of believer without restriction], nor is he stripped of the name absolutely."

The witness is he summarizes the principles of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in specific issues. He defined Faith for us, and that Faith increases and decreases. And proof for that is that whoever killed a believer committed a major sin, so his faith decreased, yet that did not strip him of that [faith] because Allah the Exalted said: (*And if two factions among the believers fight*), and named them believers. And His saying the Exalted in the verse of Retribution: (*But if any remission is made to anyone by his brother*); his brother who killed. So the family of the victim pardon. Or even in retribution in limbs and organs, not just retribution in life. This includes this and that. Even killing, which is heinous. These naturally are verses against the *Khawārij* in the issue of Takfir of the perpetrator of a major sin, and also in the issue of the Position between Two Positions about which we spoke regarding the *Mu'tazilah*.

But the witness here: Look at the expressions of *Ahl al-Sunnah*; clear, easy expressions, no ambiguity nor obscurity as these people used to do.

I was mentioning to you the speech of Ibn Baṭṭah *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* to the speech of Ibn Taymiyyah. Ibn Baṭṭah from 387 AH and Ibn Taymiyyah year 728 AH. Before them a very large amount of scholars. Even the Imam, the *Ḥāfiẓ* was in the same era, meaning an era close to the era of Imam Ibn Baṭṭah, Imam Al-Ḥāfiẓ **Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq ibn Mandah**. This family, grandfather, father, son, grandson, a class entirely of scholars, all *Ḥuffāẓ*. He was born in the year in which Imam Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī died, who died year 310 AH. In this year Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Mandah was born. Goodness is in the Ummah, Subhan Allah! This one dies and another comes holding the banner. If a master dies, another master rises.

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Mandah, author of book *Al-Īmān*, died, *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi*, year 395 AH. He mentioned in his book their method with *Sanad* (chain), and said: "**Mention of a report indicating that Faith is Speech by the Tongue, Belief by the Heart, and Action by the Pillars, Increases and Decreases:** From Sulaymān al-A'mash from Ismā'īl ibn Rajā' al-Zubaydī who said: Marwān brought out the pulpit and started the sermon before the prayer. A man stood up and said: 'O Marwān, you opposed the Sunnah. You brought out the pulpit and it was not brought out, and started the sermon before the prayer.' Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* said: 'Who is this?' They said: 'So-and-so.' Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī said: 'This one has fulfilled what is upon him. I heard the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* say: (Whoever among you sees an evil, let him change

it with his hand. If he is unable, then with his tongue. If he is unable, then with his heart, and that is the weakest of Faith).' The witness here: 'That is the weakest of Faith,' meaning Faith increases and decreases." And he cited several narrations to prove the authenticity of the Hadith, and the Hadith is authentic in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.

He also mentioned another Hadith indicating that Faith increases and decreases: "**Mention of a report indicating that Faith decreases until there remains not in the heart of the servant the weight of a mustard seed, and that striving (*Jihād*) by the heart, tongue, and hand is from Faith.** (Then he mentioned a Hadith with his chain) from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Miswar from Abū Rāfi‘ from ‘Abdullāh ibn Mas‘ūd that the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: 'There is no Prophet sent by Allah in a nation before me except that he had from his nation disciples and companions taking his Sunnah and following his command. Then successors succeed after them, saying what they do not do, and doing what they are not commanded. So whoever strives against them with his hand is a believer, and whoever strives against them with his tongue is a believer, and whoever strives against them with his heart is a believer, and there is not beyond that of Faith a mustard seed.'"

This Hadith mentioned by Ibn Mandah, the witness from it is that there are degrees ("So whoever strives against them"). There is a faith stronger than faith. "Whoever strives against them with his hand is a believer and whoever strives against them with his tongue is a believer," although striving by hand is stronger, and striving by tongue is weaker, and striving by heart is the weakest of faith. Thus Faith strengthens and weakens. This is contrary to the opinions of these people.

He also mentioned many things indicating the **Branches of Faith**: "**Mention of the Chapters and Branches which the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said are Faith, and that it is Speech by the Tongue and Knowledge by the Heart and Action by the Pillars which Jibrīl *‘alayhis salām* taught the Companions. And likewise narrated from him from the narration of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* and Al-Muṣṭafā clarified its summary.**"

Then he mentioned things in detail after that: "From the Actions of the Hearts: Intentions, Wills, Knowledge, Recognition, Awe, Submission... etc. From the Actions of the Tongue: Acknowledgment and what came from Him, and Testifying for Him with Tawhid and for His Messenger, then Tasbih, Takbir, and Tahmid. Then actions of all Limbs: Acts of obedience and obligations upon which Islam is built. First is Purification, then Five Prayers, fasting Ramadan, Zakat, Hajj... all this he mentioned.

The rest of voluntary actions, by doing which one deserves the name of Increase of Faith. And forbidden actions, by doing which one deserves the name of Decrease of Faith. Meaning the actions a human brings voluntarily, these voluntary acts increase faith by them. As for prohibitions, they decrease his faith and it weakens."

This is our scholar Al-Ḥāfiẓ Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq ibn Yaḥyā ibn Mandah, the great scholar and great *Muḥaddith* in his book *Al-Īmān*, who died year 395 AH, *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi*.

Imam Qāḍī Abū Ya'lā has good speech in his book *Masā'il al-Īmān*. We spoke about him before and said he died year 458 AH. He is a great Ḥanbalī judge and scholar among scholars. He said: "**Permissibility of Increase and Decrease in Faith, and its Increase by doing acts of obedience, and its Decrease by leaving them and doing acts of disobedience.**"

Then he mentioned the *Ash'āriyyah* after that and said: "As for the *Ash'āriyyah*, Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī said: If it is knowledge of the heart and its affirmation, they are two accidents (*'araḍān*) among accidents, and two attributes among attributes of hearts. Increase and decrease are not permissible regarding accidents; only bodies (*ajsām*) increase and decrease."

From this speech, Al-Bāqillānī acknowledges that Faith is Knowledge only. We discussed this subject and Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah's refutations of him. He refuted him because he views Faith as a single unit, meaning it does not increase nor decrease. And it is not expected that Faith accepts Exception (*Istithnā'*) either. This issue I will mention next time, *in shā' Allāh*.

He also relied on the speech of **Ibn al-Labbān**, who is a great scholar, Abū Muḥammad al-Aṣbahānī. Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn 'Asākir considered him from the third class of *Ash'āriyyah*. Imam Al-Labbān died year 446 AH, meaning he was contemporary to Qāḍī Abū Ya'lā. He said Increase and Decrease refer to Affirmation not Actions, notice this is in the belief of Ibn al-Labbān who is an Ash'ari, because Actions according to them are not from Faith itself, but rather it is Affirmation. "So among them is he who knows the informations of Allah the Exalted in detail, and among them is he who knows them in general. He who knew them in general and believed in them, if he knew their detail, his faith and detailed knowledge increased; which is that Revelation descends..." and so on.

Then he cited things based on Ibn al-Labbān's speech, and mentioned after that the text of Imam Aḥmad: "**Aḥmad stated textually**

regarding variation (*Tafāḍul*) in Knowledge also. And in the narration of Al-Marwazī: The heart varies and increases. The indication for the permissibility of Increase and Decrease generally is His saying, the Exalted: 'The believers are only those who, when Allah is mentioned, their hearts become fearful, and when His verses are recited to them, it increases them in faith; and upon their Lord they rely.' [QS. Al-Anfāl: 2] Up to His saying: 'Those are the believers, truly. For them are degrees [of high position] with their Lord and forgiveness and noble provision.' [QS. Al-Anfāl: 4] And His saying the Exalted: 'And whenever a surah is revealed, there are among them those who say, "Which of you has this increased in faith?" As for those who believed, it has increased them in faith, while they are rejoicing. But as for those in whose hearts is disease, it has increased them in evil [disbelief] to their evil.' [QS. At-Tawbah: 124-125]"

This verse is in Sūrah At-Tawbah 124. Meaning disbelief to their disbelief. If a verse or surah was revealed, they disbelieved in it, as they disbelieved in what preceded of verses and surahs, so they increased in disbelief upon disbelief.

And He, the Exalted, said:

هُوَ الَّذِي أَنزَلَ السَّكِينَةَ فِي قُلُوبِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ لِيَزْدَادُوا إِيمَانًا مَّعَ إِيمَانِهِمْ

"It is He who sent down tranquility into the hearts of the believers that they would increase in faith along with their [present] faith." [QS. Al-Fatḥ: 4]

And His saying the Exalted:

وَالَّذِينَ اهْتَدَوْا زَادَهُمْ هُدًى وَآتَاهُمْ تَقْوَاهُمْ

"And those who are guided - He increases them in guidance and gives them their righteousness." [QS. Muḥammad: 17]

Notice: "increases them in guidance," meaning Faith increases and decreases. And He said:

إِنَّمَا يَخْشَى اللَّهَ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ الْعُلَمَاءُ

"Only those fear Allah, from among His servants, who have knowledge." [QS. Fāṭir: 28]

And He said:

لِيَسْتَيْقِنَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ وَيَزْدَادَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِيمَانًا

"That the people of the Scripture may reach certainty and those who have believed may increase in faith." [QS. Al-Muddaththir: 31]

Then he discussed Imam Ibn ʻAqīl and concluded the following: "**The Scholars of the Sunnah say: Faith increases with obedience and decreases with disobedience.** Imam Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal narrated with his chain from Abū Hurayrah that he used to say: 'Faith increases and decreases.' And it was narrated also from Abū al-Dardā': 'That Faith decreases and increases'."

Then he mentioned speech by Imam ʻAbdullāh ibn Baṭṭah, saying: "**'Abdullāh ibn Baṭṭah narrated with his chain from Ibn 'Abbās the like of Abū Hurayrah's saying. And it was also narrated from 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb that he used to take the hand of a man and two men, saying: 'Come let us increase in Faith.' And it was narrated from Muʻādh that he said: 'Sit with us, let us believe.' And it was narrated from Abū al-Dardā' that he said: 'Ibn Rawāḥah used to take my hand and say: Come let us believe for an hour.' Abū Ḥafṣ ibn Shāhīn narrated with his chain from Ibn 'Abbās and Abū Hurayrah and Abū al-Dardā': 'Faith increases and decreases.' And Abū Muḥammad al-Khallāl narrated with his chain from Muʻādh from the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* who said: 'Faith increases and decreases.'**"

He discussed the interpretations of opponents and addressed them in detail. But I tried to present to you from the book *Al-Īmān* by Qāḍī Abū Yaʻlā briefly; as an indication that what we say is not an innovation in speech, and that this is the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʻah*, and that these are our scholars and they are the ones who spread the religion for us.

Regarding other sects like the *Ashʻāriyyah*, they differed in it and did not adopt one opinion. Some of them denied Increase and Decrease in Faith. Some affirmed both. Some affirmed Increase without Decrease. So everyone has a point of view, so they differed among themselves, due to the texts. What can he do before these verses? And what can he interpret? They are all cold interpretations, wrong interpretations, scholars refuted them.

Summary:

The opinion on Faith according to the *Ashʻāriyyah*: He who said it is Affirmation only says it does not increase nor decrease. Those who said "increases and decreases" said: increase in the essence of Affirmation. This is philosophical speech contradicting language, reality, and clear Qur'anic verses. The third opinion among them is that Faith increases but does not

decrease, which is not a common opinion among them. But the majority of *Ash'āriyyah* say Faith increases and decreases, although they have analyses differing from the interpretations of the *Salaf*.

As for the **Māturīdiyyah**, the famous opinion among them, and almost the sole opinion, is that **Faith does not increase nor decrease**.

According to **Ahl al-Sunnah**: **Faith increases and decreases**. I have mentioned to you many references and much speech. I conclude this with the Hadith mentioned by Bukhari and Muslim, and mentioned by Imam Al-Ājurrī in his book *Al-Sharī'ah*. He cited with his chain from Suhayl ibn Abī Ṣāliḥ from 'Abdullāh ibn Dīnār from Abū Ṣāliḥ from Abū Hurayrah who said: The Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said: ("Faith is sixty-some or seventy-some branches, the best of them is *Lā ilāha illā Allāh* and the lowest is removing harm from the path, and Modesty (*Ḥayā'*) is a branch of the branches of Faith"). Narrated by Imam Al-Bukhārī in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* and Muslim. It is among the strongest proofs that Faith is partitioned and has many branches.

Then Imam Al-Ājurrī cited a chapter and said: "**Chapter: Mentioning what indicates the Increase and Decrease of Faith.**" He mentioned evidences from the Book and Sunnah and many Hadiths. For whoever wants to increase [in knowledge] from youths and students, he can learn a lot from them.

And the verses we recited to you, His saying the Exalted: (*Indeed, they were youths who believed in their Lord, and We increased them in guidance*) [QS. Al-Kahf: 13]. And His saying: (*The believers are only those who, when Allah is mentioned, their hearts become fearful, and when His verses are recited to them, it increases them in faith; and upon their Lord they rely*) [QS. Al-Anfāl: 2]. And His saying: (*It is He who sent down tranquility into the hearts of the believers that they would increase in faith along with their [present] faith*) [QS. Al-Fatḥ: 4]. "Along with their faith," so what after this?!

Then we discuss after that interpretations and explanations. All this because they did not include Actions in Faith. Not only this, but it is also an issue of Partitioning (*Tab'īḍ*). They believed that Faith is a single unit that cannot be partitioned. This is the problem. All of them: *Khawārij*, *Ash'āriyyah*, and *Karrāmiyyah*; even those who include actions and those who expel them.

As for *Ahl al-Sunnah*, they include Actions and believe it is partitioned. In most Ash'ari texts and books etc., you will find justifications and things and very big contradictions between Al-Ījī, Al-Rāzī, and Al-

Juwaynī, between this one and that one. You find philosophical contradictions for which Allah sent down no authority.

I suffice with this amount. With the coming lesson, *in shā' Allāh*, if there is life remaining, we will speak about **Exception in Faith** (*Istithnā'*): Is it permissible to say "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*"? Or "I am a believer truly"? And other issues.

I ask Allah the Great, Lord of the Great Throne, to make our words purely for His Noble Face, and to benefit with these words, and make them in the scale of our good deeds on the Day of Resurrection, and expiate by them our sins and faults and acts of disobedience. I ask Allah to encompass you in His mercy and accept our righteous deeds. *Āmīn, Āmīn*.

May Allah bless you..

Wa al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh..

The Ninth Lesson

Exception in Faith:

Verily, all praise is due to Allah; we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allah from the evils of our souls and our bad deeds. Whomever Allah guides, there is no one to misguide him, and whomever He leads astray, there is no guide for him. I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, alone with no partner, and that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ تُقَاتِهِ وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُم مُّسْلِمُونَ

"O you who have believed, fear Allah as He should be feared and do not die except as Muslims." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 102]

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُم مِّن نَّفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا وَبَثَّ مِنْهُمَا رِجَالًا كَثِيرًا وَنِسَاءً ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا

"O mankind, fear your Lord, who created you from one soul and created from it its mate and dispersed from both of them many men and women. And fear Allah, through whom you ask one another, and the wombs. Indeed Allah is ever, over you, an Observer." [QS. An-Nisā’: 1]

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَقُولُوا قَوْلًا سَدِيدًا * يُصْلِحْ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ ۗ وَمَن يُطِعِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيمًا

"O you who have believed, fear Allah and speak words of appropriate justice. He will [then] amend for you your deeds and forgive you your sins. And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has certainly attained a great attainment." [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 70-71]

To proceed:

The most truthful speech is the Book of Allah, and the best guidance is the guidance of Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. And the worst of matters are their innovations, and every innovation is a heresy (*bid‘ah*), and every heresy is a misguidance, and every misguidance is in the Fire.

Honored brothers, here we are on the fifteenth day of the month of Muḥarram for the year 1433 of the blessed Prophetic Hijrah. And we are also with the **Ninth Lesson** of this Sharia course, whose title we chose to be: *Masā'il fī al-Īmān* (Issues Regarding Faith).

Today, *in shā' Allāh*, we will speak about **Exception (*Istithnā'*)** and about the relationship of Islam with Faith. And if there is remaining time, *in shā' Allāh*, we will answer the question about **Imam Abū Ḥanīfah**: Was he a *Murji'*? And what is the truth in that?

As for the main issue, we will speak about a subject of the subjects of dispute or the effects resulting from the dispute in the appellation of Faith. This is a famous issue, and it is among the subsidiary issues, which is the issue of **Exception (*Istithnā'*)**.

We will speak about the sayings of scholars on Exception. And if Exception in Faith is permissible, is Exception in Islam also permissible? We will review some opinions of scholars and great Imams who spoke on this issue. We will also learn about the opinion of the *Ash'āriyyah* and *Māturīdiyyah* on this issue.

Exception means saying: "**I am a believer *in shā' Allāh* (if Allah wills).**" This Exception is not linguistic exception. There is linguistic exception, which is exception using tools of exception; we say: "The students attended except (*illā*) a student." Or exception using (*ghayr*, *siwā*, *'adā*, *khalā*); this is linguistic exception. As for the Exception we intend, it is Sharia exception, and it is specific and established as a Sharia terminology, meaning: Is it permissible for me to say: "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*"?

I told you before that those who defined Faith and made it a single unit that is not partitioned nor divided, especially those who defined it as Heart Affirmation only, or Knowledge only, or mere Acknowledgment, these people said Exception is forbidden and considered it doubt (*shakk*). This is according to those who expelled Actions from the appellation of Faith.

But the sayings of scholars on this issue, we summarize them as follows:

Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah tried to review the opinions and said:

- There is a group saying Exception is **Obligatory** (*Wājib*), and they are the **Kullābiyyah**, and they have a justification for that; they say Exception is obligatory.

- The other opinion is contrary to this, which is **Prohibition** (*Taḥrīm*) of Exception, and it is the opinion of the **Murji'ah**, **Jahmiyyah**, **Ḥanafīs**, and **Māturīdiyyah**.
- The third opinion, which is the opinion of the majority of the *Salaf* and the majority of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, is the **Permissibility** (*Jawāz*) of Exception and the **Permissibility of Leaving it**.

We will detail this issue later. But this is in general. So, an opinion says Exception is Obligatory, like the *Kullābiyyah*. An opinion says Exception is Forbidden, like the *Murji'ah*, *Jahmiyyah*, Ḥanafīs, and *Māturīdiyyah*. And the third opinion says Exception and Leaving it are Permissible, which is the famous opinion among the *Salaf* and *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

But a sayer might say regarding those who said Exception is obligatory: What is the reason for their saying it is obligatory? The 'Illah (legal cause) for them is that this Faith, which a person believes in, they considered something called **Muwāfāh** (Dying State), meaning death at the end of his life: will he die a believer or die a disbeliever? Therefore they said Exception is obligatory because he does not know will he die a believer or die a disbeliever. Scholars rejected this justification from them. *Ahl al-Sunnah* have another justification, and the reason according to *Ahl al-Sunnah* differs from the reason according to these who permitted it[26]. But these say it is obligatory.

They also have another justification that **Absolute Faith** (*Al-Īmān al-Muṭlaq*) implies doing all commanded things. A human cannot or it is not within his capability to bring all these acts of obedience and actions and say "I am a believer" in this regard, as if he is purifying himself (*yuzakkī nafsahu*). "I am a believer" means: "I performed all these commands and abstained from all these prohibitions," so it is as if he testifies for himself regarding Paradise or testifies for himself regarding Complete Faith and purifies himself. Therefore they made Exception obligatory.

Although this justification they said is also a justification according to scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, and it is the opinion of Imam Aḥmad and the opinion of scholars in the issue of Actions. But this we will detail later; rather we speak in general now.

As for the other saying which forbade Exception, and they are the *Murji'ah* and *Jahmiyyah*, their premise is that **Faith is one thing**. Thus when I say "I am a believer and acknowledger of Allah and affirmer of

[26] Text says "those who permitted," likely refers to the obligatory group in context of Muwafah.

Allah and affirmer of His Book and affirmer of His Messenger" and say "*in shā' Allāh*," then the meaning of that is I am doubting. Thus this is not a believer. How does one make exception in his faith? Meaning in the sense of Heart Knowledge and Heart Affirmation. Or regarding Acknowledgment with the phrase: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*) *in shā' Allāh*; this is not permissible even according to scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah*.

So this is their premise because they restricted Faith and made it one thing and placed it in Heart Knowledge. Or even those who said Acknowledgment... they said regarding Acknowledgment even by tongue, they said mere testimony "I testify there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah" is for conducting worldly rulings; so even with merely this word, Exception is not permissible in it. Therefore they forbade Exception.

As for the opinion of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, the issue differs for them: They said **Permissibility of Exception and Permissibility of Leaving it**. Permissibility of Exception meaning he says: "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*." And Permissibility of Leaving it, meaning someone says to you: "Are you a believer?" In this question it is possible to leave it [exception], because this question was considered by some *Salaf* a question of innovation. That we say to him: "Have you believed in Allah and His angels and His books?" "I am a believer, not doubting." But I make exception in **Actions**.

I say regarding Actions: Requirements, commands, prohibitions. Who can say "I performed all these Sharia commands of obligations, voluntary acts, duties, and recommended acts"? So if I said "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*," it is because this [absolute statement] means self-purification, and implies that a human, no matter how much obedience he performs, will remain negligent. Therefore if the issue is in the sense of self-purification regarding Actions, then here I say to him: "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*."

As for Faith as **Heart Belief** (*I'tiqād Qalbī*) or Faith which is the saying of Testimony and Acknowledgment of the word of Tawhid, Exception is not permissible in this. Exception is forbidden, not permissible at all. This is doubt. How can I say: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh in shā' Allāh*)?! Hanging it like this on the future! They said this is not permissible. Scholars of *Ahl al-Sunnah* and Companions and Righteous *Salaf* all of them said Exception is not permissible in Heart Belief and Acknowledgment by tongue in the word of Tawhid.

As for Actions, I make exception in them out of avoiding self-purification. Out of fearing for myself that I purify myself or that someone understands I am purifying myself. "I am a believer and finished all obligations and acts of obedience," as if I am testifying for myself regarding Paradise. Here the *Salaf* feared this. Therefore they used to make exception in Actions and not make exception in Heart Belief, nor make exception in the word of Tawhid uttered by the tongue.

This is the whole issue with this simplification I told you.

Regarding the **Position of the Ash‘āriyyah**: Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī, as I told you, differs from the majority of *Ash‘āriyyah* in that he made exception. He permits Exception. As for the late ones, they do not permit it. The proof for that is I read the text of *Al-‘Aqīdah al-Nasafiyyah* before, and the saying of ‘Umar ibn Muḥammad al-Nasafī, an Imam of the Nasafī Imams and has the book *Al-‘Aqā’id al-Nasafiyyah* among books taught by them, died 537 AH. He said: "**If Affirmation and Acknowledgment are found from the servant, it is correct for him to say 'I am a believer truly' and he should not say 'I am a believer *in shā’ Allāh*'.**"

This is settled among the late scholars among the majority of late *Ash‘āriyyah*, that they do not make exception and say "I am a believer truly." They intend [this] because Faith for them is Knowledge, Heart Acknowledgment, and they delay Actions and do not consider them. Even the one who considers Actions considers them a condition of perfection. But the basis is that the believer acknowledges in his heart. Even the mere word of Tawhid: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*) is for conducting worldly rulings on people regarding eating their slaughtered animals, marriage, dealing with them, and intermarriage etc. But if a human died and did not utter this word (word of Tawhid) and did not perform anything, while his appearance in this world is disbeliever, but he died; they believe if his heart believed Faith and he did not bow nor prostrate nor do anything, he is a believer. This is the origin of the problem and dispute in this issue.

Naturally, even those who permit Exception... and this innovation invented by Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī and some people of innovation in the past, which is the story of **Exception based on Muwāfāh** (Dying State). Meaning he says if the human is in the Preserved Tablet (*Al-Lawḥ Al-Maḥfūẓ*) that he will die a disbeliever, and he did all these good deeds and virtues and was a believer, then in the end of his life he died and Allah wrote disbelief upon him. Naturally they make exception for the sake of this. Those who permit even Exception permit it on this basis.

The *Kullābiyyah*, we told you, make it obligatory based on *Muwāfāh* too. And the *Ash'āriyyah* who permitted it, permitted it based on *Muwāfāh*. This is what Imam Al-Taftāzānī said in *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid* when he mentioned this issue and said based on *Muwāfāh* in the future. Meaning that a human, even if he does pleasing deeds and is a believer and prays and performs pillars and actions, but in Allah's knowledge he will die a disbeliever, Exception is permissible in this case. But we told you the *Kullābiyyah* obligate Exception based on *Muwāfāh*.

Therefore they introduced strange things and assumed things. They said if the human is in Allah's knowledge a disbeliever, then even if he performed anything in this world, he remains a disbeliever like that and remains not pleasing [to Allah]. Meaning dialectical assumptions in their brains, and that the person is pleasing to Allah too. Therefore they said the Companions, even if they worshipped idols and disbelieved before they believed, they were pleasing too [to Allah previously], because it was known to Allah they would die believers. Meaning inventions and splitting of minds from speech after philosophers emptied these doubts into their brains. Meaning things the *Salaf* did not speak about and things a human might go astray in.

Therefore we say it on this basis, because a sayer might say there are *Ash'āriyyah* permitting Exception. What is the difference between permissibility of Exception according to *Ahl al-Sunnah* and permissibility of Exception according to them? Permissibility of Exception according to *Ahl al-Sunnah* is **in Actions**, and they do not speak about the issue of *Muwāfāh* which is in the Unseen Knowledge that a human will die a disbeliever. We speak about his apparent ruling before us in this world. That we say this because no one can imagine he will perform all these obligations and acts of obedience and recommended acts and voluntary acts or leave prohibitions. Even if he performed them and said "I am a believer," it is feared for him that it be self-purification. Therefore they were cautious and said yes, Exception is here so that Exception does not fall into purifying oneself.

Therefore, a human considers: if he intends by his saying "Are you a believer?" meaning "Do you doubt or not?" **I do not doubt in my faith**. I am a believer with Faith of speech, action, and belief. There is no slightest doubt naturally, because slightest doubt means *Kufr*. And the Testimony of Tawhid, I have no doubt in this word. I say: "I am a believer, I testify that (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*)." I have no doubt in this. But Exception comes only in **Actions** and in **Acts of Obedience** because Purification is feared.

Even these are the responses of Imam Aḥmad in his treatises narrated from him by Aḥmad ibn Ja‘far al-Qaṭī‘ī when he asked him, and he clarified that Exception is in Actions and is not in Heart Belief nor in the saying of Acknowledgment of the word of Tawhid.

So we come to the issue of **Texts**. What are the evidences upon which the *Salaf* relied in this issue? And was this issue not known among the Companions? Rather it was known even among ‘Abdullāh ibn Mas‘ūd who summarized this issue for us.

This issue exists, mentioned by Imam Ibn Sallām died 224 AH in his book *Al-Īmān* in detail. He mentioned evidences and transmitted narrations from Companions and from ‘Abdullāh ibn Mas‘ūd and from some scholars of the *Salaf*. He transmitted it before Imam Al-Ājurrī, and transmitted it before Imam Aḥmad, and Imams after him transmitted it, and so on scholars of the *Salaf*.

But Imam Al-Ājurrī also summarized this issue for us in his book *Al-Sharī‘ah* when he said: "**And from the attribute of the People of Truth among those we mentioned of the people of knowledge is Exception in Faith. Not by way of Doubt, we seek refuge in Allah from doubt in Faith, but out of fear of Purification for themselves regarding perfection of Faith. He does not know is he among those deserving the reality of Faith or not. That is because the people of knowledge among the People of Truth, if asked 'Are you a believer?' said: 'I believed in Allah, His angels, His books, His messengers, the Last Day, Paradise, Fire, and the likes of this.' The one uttering this and affirming it with his heart is a believer. Exception in Faith is only because he does not know is he among those deserving what Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla* described the believers with of the reality of Faith or not. This is the path of the Companions *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhum* and the Successors to them in goodness.**"

According to them, Exception as Al-Ājurrī says... Exception is in Actions, not in Speech and Affirmation by the heart. Rather Exception is in Actions necessitating the reality of Faith. People according to them are outwardly believers; by it they inherit, by it they marry, and by it rulings of the Millah of Islam run. "But Exception from them is according to what we clarified to you and scholars clarified before us." He means according to what he said before, which is Exception in Actions; five prayers, zakat, hajj, obligations, pillars... these acts of obedience and voluntary acts and charities, all these acts of righteousness; who can perform all this? It might be feared if he said "I am a believer" in this sense too, its meaning is it might be feared for him that he purifies himself. It is understood from him

that he purifies himself, meaning testifies for himself that he came with the complete reality of Faith which necessitates Paradise for him.

Or that a human, even when he prays, does not know whether his prayer was accepted or not. Because a human when he prays or gives charity or gives zakat asks Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* to accept it from him, and he does not know if it was accepted or not accepted. So he makes exception on this basis too.

What are the evidences from the Book? When you say Exception is forbidden because Exception means doubt, "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*" as if you are hanging it and making exception. This Exception appeared in the Holy Qur'an too. Read in Sūrah Al-Fatḥ, Allah the Exalted says:

لَتَدْخُلُنَّ الْمَسْجِدَ الْحَرَامَ إِن شَاءَ اللَّهُ آمِنِينَ

"You will surely enter al-Masjid al-Haram, if Allah wills, in safety." [QS. Al-Fatḥ: 27]

Notice: (*In shā' Allāh, in safety*). Who is the Speaker? Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* is the Speaker. So Allah is Knowing that they are entering, yet He said "*in shā' Allāh*" as exception. Thus this is **Exception upon Certainty** (*Yaqīn*). Does anyone say this contains doubt? This is exception upon certainty.

And also in the Hadith of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, when the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* entered the graveyard he said: ("Peace be upon you, abode of believing people, and we, *in shā' Allāh*, will follow you"). Look to his saying: ("And we, *in shā' Allāh*, will follow you"). The Messenger knows that every soul will die and in the end they must follow their brothers who died before, yet he made exception.

And he *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said: ("I hope that I am the most fearing of you to Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*") and it is known also that the Messenger is the most fearing of us to Allah, yet he made exception.

And it was narrated that a man said in the presence of 'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd: "I am a believer." Ibn Mas'ūd said: "Are you then from the people of Paradise?" He said: "I hope." Ibn Mas'ūd said: "Why did you not entrust the first as you said the other?" Meaning you could say: "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*," on the basis of Purification. Because he wants to teach him that "believer" here means he performed actions and performed acts of obedience, and it is understood from it that he testified for himself regarding Paradise. Therefore he said to him: "Are you from the people of

Paradise?" But Ibn Mas‘ūd *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* did not intend Faith in the sense of Heart Belief or in the sense of the word of Tawhid (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*) by which the servant enters Islam. But he intends Actions.

A man said to ‘Alqamah: "Are you a believer?" He said: "I hope, *in shā’ Allāh*."

Therefore Imam Al-Ājurrī said: "This is the *Madhhab* of many scholars and it is the *Madhhab* of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal. And Aḥmad argued with what we mentioned." Meaning Imam Aḥmad in his *Masā’il* and his *Rasā’il* used to argue with this. And he argued with the questioning of the two angels in the grave for the believer and their answering him, they say to him: "**Upon Certainty (*Yaqīn*) you were, and upon it you died, and upon it you will be resurrected on the Day of Resurrection *in shā’ Allāh Ta‘ālā*.**" And it is said to the disbeliever and hypocrite: "**Upon Doubt (*Shakk*) you were, and upon it you died, and upon it you will be resurrected *in shā’ Allāh*.**" They know he will be resurrected, yet they made exception. So this is **Exception upon Certainty**, exception in a matter definitively known. So the *Salaf* used to make exception in these issues.

And Imam Aḥmad, when commenting that exception is only for Action, and Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla* said: (*You will surely enter al-Masjid al-Haram, if Allah wills, in safety*), so this is exception without doubt. And the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: ("I hope that I am the most fearing of you to Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla*"). He said: "All this is strengthening for Exception in Faith."

Therefore also in a narration cited with his chain by Imam Al-Ājurrī, he said in the Hadith of Al-Faḍl ibn Ziyād: "I heard Abū ‘Abdillāh [Imam Ahmad] preferring Exception in Faith." A man said to him: "People are only two men: Believer and Disbeliever." ‘Abdullāh said: "**Then where is (*And others deferred to the command of Allah - whether He will punish them or whether He will forgive them. And Allah is Knowing and Wise*) [QS. At-Tawbah: 106]?**" And he said: I heard Abū ‘Abdillāh saying I heard Yaḥyā ibn Sa‘īd saying: "I have not caught up with anyone except upon Exception." And he said: I heard Abū ‘Abdillāh once say: I heard Yaḥyā say: "I have not caught up with anyone from the people of knowledge nor reached me anything except Exception."

This is the saying of the *Salaf* and scholars of the *Salaf* and Companions. Yet these late *Ash‘āriyyah* say Exception is forbidden! And that a human says "I am a believer truly!" These are verses from the Holy

Qur'an, and Hadiths, and evidences, then these scholars of the *Salaf* used to make exception.

Imam Ibn Sallām when he mentioned with his chain also mentioned these issues and mentioned from Imam Al-Awzā'ī. Imam Al-Awzā'ī used to say it, and say this is permissible and this is permissible, but it is good to say "*in shā' Allāh*," to say "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*."

Even those who inferred with the Hadith of Abū Hurayrah *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* that the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* came to the graveyard and said: ("Peace be upon you, abode of believing people, and we, *in shā' Allāh*, will follow you"). The Messenger said it like this even though he is upon certainty and it is a definitive matter that every soul will die and definitive they will follow them.

Those who said Exception in Faith is forbidden because they said Faith is like the faith of Jibrīl and like the faith of angels... Faith is one, indivisible, and like the faith of prophets. Therefore Imam Ibn Sallām denounced them and said: How is this equal with these believers? And he mentioned textually like this, saying: "How can it be permissible for anyone to liken humans to angels while Allah has admonished the believers in more than one place in His Book with the severest admonition, and threatened them with the harshest threat? And it is not known that Allah did any of that to the angels." Meaning rebuked angels or threatened them.

He says: "He, the Exalted, said: 'O you who have believed, do not consume one another's wealth unjustly but only [in lawful] business by mutual consent. And do not kill yourselves [or one another]. Indeed, Allah is to you ever Merciful. And whoever does that in aggression and injustice - then We will drive him into a Fire. And that, for Allah, is [always] easy.' This is in Sūrah An-Nisā' [29-30]. And He said also: 'O you who have believed, fear Allah and give up what remains [due to you] of interest, if you should be believers. And if you do not, then be informed of a war from Allah and His Messenger.' [QS. Al-Baqarah: 278-279]. And the verses in Sūrah Al-Baqarah. And He said: 'O you who have believed, why do you say what you do not do?' [QS. Al-Ṣaff: 2] in Sūrah Al-Ṣaff. And He said, the Exalted: 'Has the time not come for those who have believed that their hearts should become humble to the remembrance of Allah and what has come down of the truth? And let them not be like those who were given the Scripture before, and a long period passed over them, so their hearts hardened; and many of them are defiantly disobedient.' [QS. Al-Ḥadīd: 16] in Sūrah Al-Ḥadīd. So He threatened them with Fire in a verse, and informed them of war in another, and frightened them with hatred (*maqt*) in a third, and found them slow in a fourth. And He in all this calls them

believers. So what resemblance do these have to Jibrīl and Mīkā’īl considering their status with Allah? I fear that this is from audacity against Allah and ignorance of His Book."

This is for those who did not make exception and forbade Exception because Faith for them is one faith. He said if this is what Allah did with those He named believers, He threatened them, warned them, intimidated them, and found them slow, this did not happen to the angels. So how do you say your faith is the faith of Jibrīl, or your faith is like the faith of these angels?!

This is the text of Imam Ibn Sallām in this issue. And he transmitted many texts. I do not want to burden you with the abundance of these texts; they are all irrefutable witnesses indicating that the subject of Exception... that this Exception is permissible, and that Exception in Faith is permissible, and that the *Salaf* used to say that, and that no one denied this. But Exception, if I say "I am a believer" meaning doubt in my faith in the sense of Heart Belief, is not permissible. You doubt in Heart Belief? And doubt that you believe in Allah and His angels and His books and His messengers and the Last Day and *Qadar* its good and its bad, you doubt in this, saying "*in shā’ Allāh* I believe in this"?!

We are not speaking about this. But we speak about "I am a believer *in shā’ Allāh*" in the sense of **Actions**; because Allah the Exalted says:

فَلَا تُزَكُّوا أَنفُسَكُمْ ۖ هُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِمَنِ اتَّقَىٰ

"So do not claim yourselves to be pure; He is most knowing of who fears Him." [QS. Al-Najm: 32]

Therefore scholars mentioned it for this reason.

So this is the speech of Imams of the *Salaf* in this issue. Naturally the Imams in their books, and Ibn Taymiyyah *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi* detailed very greatly in his book *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* or *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ* and refuted these doubts of theirs and their evidences in detail.

But there is an issue: **Regarding the Muslim, is it permissible for him to say: "I am a Muslim *in shā’ Allāh*"?**

Scholars said: It is permissible, just as it is permissible in Faith. If he intends in Islam the meaning of the Five Pillars, intends prayer and zakat and these things, yes, Exception is permissible for him in **Complete Islam**, **Absolute Islam**, which is Islam by performing pillars and actions. So Exception is permissible like Faith here.

But if he intends by it Exception in the sense of **Islam in its origin** which is realized by the *Shahādatayn*, meaning he says: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh in shā' Allāh*), it is definitively not permissible. So Exception is not permissible in the origin of Islam by which the *Shahādatayn* are realized and by which entering Islam is completed. As for Permissible Exception, it is Absolute Islam with its actions, then yes it is permissible in that. And naturally it is the same issue, similar to the issue of Faith.

This issue will drag us to the issue of the **Relationship between Islam and Faith**. But before we finish completely we say: The opinion of the *Salaf* is the approved opinion, and it is the opinion said by the Companions of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*, and it is the opinion narrated from the Messenger of Allah, and it is the opinion attested to by the Holy Qur'an that Exception is permissible as in the narration of Ibn Mas'ūd: "**Exception is permissible in Faith because Faith is Speech and Action. We have come with Speech and we fear we have been negligent in Action.**" "So it pleases me that exception is made in Faith by saying 'I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*'." This is speech narrated from 'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* and Imam Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal also transmitted it from him. And naturally we told you the evidences on which they relied.

Relationship of Islam with Faith:

As for the issue related to this subject also in the dispute regarding the appellation of Faith, this is an issue in which the *Salaf* differed too, even the majority of *Ahl al-Sunnah* differ in it, which is: **What is the connection between Faith (*Īmān*) and Islam? Is Faith Islam and is Islam Faith?**

There are several opinions: A team from *Ahl al-Sunnah* says **Synonymity** (*Tarāduf*) between them, meaning they are two names for one named object. Islam is Faith and Faith is Islam. This opinion exists among *Ahl al-Sunnah*. And naturally the opinion is from Imam **Al-Bukhārī** *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* died in the year 256 AH, and he is among those who led this opinion.

And the witty thing in the matter is that those who said Synonymity, meaning Islam is Faith and Faith is Islam, relied on the **Hadith of Jibrīl** which I mentioned to you and read in the first lecture. But the Hadith ("This is Jibrīl who came to you to teach you your religion")... this Hadith when he asked him about Islam and about Faith and about *Iḥsān*, this Hadith was relied upon by Al-Bukhārī on the last phrase in the Hadith which is he said: ("Came to teach you your religion"). Thus Islam is Faith and Faith is Islam

in the sense of synonymity even if they came together, meaning they are one. Meaning this is apparent belief and the other is hidden belief, so they are one. Meaning whether they were separate, whether they came together in one text, the two have one meaning.

Some scholars tried to find a clarification for this issue. And Imam Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī tried to justify this: How can their meaning be one while the Messenger answered about apparent pillars of Islam, then spoke about hidden pillars of Faith?

But the justification is that Imam Al-Bukhārī sees they are one because the Hadith says: ("Came to you to teach you your religion"). Meaning **this is the Religion**. Meaning a human cannot come with a part and not come with another part. Meaning he comes with what is called these apparent pillars, and the pillars in the inward are separated from the pillars... meaning action and internal belief. So this is the Religion.

And this is an opinion of Imam Al-Bukhārī, and also Imam **Isḥāq ibn Mandah** also mentioned speech like this, and said they are two names for one meaning. And each began listing evidences. What are the evidences relied upon by Imam Al-Bukhārī? He inferred with the saying of Allah the Exalted:

فَمَن يُرِدِ اللَّهُ أَن يَهْدِيَهُ يَشْرَحْ صَدْرَهُ لِلْإِسْلَامِ

"So whoever Allah wants to guide - He expands his breast to Islam." [QS. Al-An‘ām: 125]

As in Sūrah Al-An‘ām. And the saying of Allah the Exalted:

أَفَمَن شَرَحَ اللَّهُ صَدْرَهُ لِلْإِسْلَامِ فَهُوَ عَلَىٰ نُورٍ مِّن رَّبِّهِ

"So is one whose breast Allah has expanded to Islam and he is upon a light from his Lord..." [QS. Az-Zumar: 22]

So Allah praised Islam with the like of what He praised Faith with, and made it a name of praise and purification.

And He informed that whoever submitted (*aslama*) is upon a light from his Lord. And Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* says:

وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا

"And I have approved for you Islam as religion." [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 3]

And He said to the Prophets:

وَمَن يَرْغَبُ عَن مِّلَّةِ إِبْرَاهِيمَ إِلَّا مَن سَفِهَ نَفْسَهُ

"And who would be averse to the religion of Abraham except one who makes a fool of himself." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 130]

رَبَّنَا وَاجْعَلْنَا مُسْلِمَيْنِ لَكَ وَمِن ذُرِّيَّتِنَا أُمَّةً مُّسْلِمَةً لَّكَ

"Our Lord, and make us Muslims [in submission] to You and from our descendants a Muslim nation [in submission] to You." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 128]

And Yūsuf said:

تَوَفَّنِي مُسْلِمًا وَأَلْحِقْنِي بِالصَّالِحِينَ

"Cause me to die a Muslim and join me with the righteous." [QS. Yūsuf: 101]

And He *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* said:

وَوَصَّىٰ بِهَا إِبْرَاهِيمُ بَنِيهِ وَيَعْقُوبُ يَا بَنِيَّ إِنَّ اللَّهَ اصْطَفَىٰ لَكُمُ الدِّينَ فَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُم مُّسْلِمُونَ

"And Abraham instructed his sons [to do the same] and [so did] Jacob, [saying], 'O my sons, indeed Allah has chosen for you this religion, so do not die except while you are Muslims.'" [QS. Al-Baqarah: 132]

And He said:

وَقُل لِّلَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ وَالْأُمِّيِّينَ أَأَسْلَمْتُمْ ۖ فَإِنْ أَسْلَمُوا فَقَدِ اهْتَدَوْا

"And say to those who were given the Scripture and [to] the unlearned, 'Have you submitted yourselves?' And if they submit [in Islam], they are rightly guided." [QS. Āl 'Imrān: 20]

Meaning many verses.

قُولُوا آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَمَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْنَا

"Say, [O believers], 'We have believed in Allah and what has been revealed to us...'" [QS. Al-Baqarah: 136]

Up to His saying:

فَإِنْ آمَنُوا بِمِثْلِ مَا آمَنتُم بِهِ فَقَدِ اهْتَدَوْا

"So if they believe in the like of that which you believe, then they are rightly guided." [QS. Al-Baqarah: 137]

So Allah judged that whoever submitted (*aslama*) has been guided, so He equated between them. Meaning between Faith and Islam. Thus (*Say, "We have believed"*) and this (*And whoever desires other than Islam as religion - never will it be accepted from him*) [QS. Āl 'Imrān: 85]. So it is the intended meaning. So He equated between Islam and Faith.

This opinion was inclined to by the great scholar Al-Ḥāfiẓ **Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī**, and he said they are synonymous and they have one meaning. So the issue is disputed among *Ahl al-Sunnah*. This is the **First Opinion**.

As for the **Second Opinion**, it is **Differentiating** (*Tafrīq*) between the appellation of Islam and Faith. And that Islam is the Word and Faith is the Action. This is the saying of a group of the *Salaf*, among them Imam **Al-Zuhrī** and **Ḥammād ibn Zayd**, and in a narration from **Imam Aḥmad**.

They inferred with the verse of Sūrah Al-Ḥujurāt:

قَالَتِ الْأَعْرَابُ آمَنَّا ۖ قُل لَّمْ تُؤْمِنُوا وَلَٰكِن قُولُوا أَسْلَمْنَا

"The Bedouins say, 'We have believed.' Say, 'You have not [yet] believed; but say [instead], "We have submitted."'" [QS. Al-Ḥujurāt: 14]

And they said that the correct interpretation of the verse is not as Imam Al-Bukhārī mentioned that they are one, because the preponderant opinion in interpreting this verse is that they are not believers with complete faith. Just as he negated Faith from the killer and fornicator and thief ("The fornicator does not fornicate while he is a believer, nor does the thief steal while he is a believer"), they said its meaning is he is not a believer with complete faith, and it does not mean that Faith was stripped from him entirely so he became a disbeliever.

There are also very many evidences, the witness in them is that these scholars differentiated between the appellation of Islam and Faith, and that Islam is the Word and Faith is the Action. And they differentiated between them whether they came together or each one came alone.

But there is an opinion of **Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah** and he relied on the *Salaf*, so he said: The *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in this issue is that between Islam and Faith there is **Inseparability (*Talāzum*) with Separation of their Names**. Meaning in case of **Conjunction** (*Iqtirān*), Islam and Faith differ as in the Hadith of Jibrīl. If they are conjoined, the meaning of Islam is apparent matters and Faith is hidden pillars; this is if

they came together as in the Hadith of Jibrīl. And if they **Separated** (*Iftaraqā*), Faith is Islam and Islam is Faith.

Islam is from Faith like the two Testimonies are one from the other. The testimony of Messengerhood is other than the testimony of Oneness. They are two things in entities (*a'yān*), and one of them is linked to the other in meaning. Likewise Islam and Faith. **There is no Faith for one who has no Islam, and no Islam for one who has no Faith.** Since the believer is not devoid of Islam by which his faith is realized, and the Muslim is not devoid of faith by which his Islam is valid. This is the correct opinion, that there is inseparability between them.

Therefore Ibn Taymiyyah likened it to the **Body and Soul**. We have no soul except with a body, and no living body except with the soul. And one of them is not the other. **Faith is like the Soul**; for it subsists by the soul and is connected to the body. And **Islam is like the Body**; and the body is not alive except with the soul, meaning they are inseparable. Not that the name of one is the other. And the Islam of hypocrites is like the body of the dead, a body without a soul. So the hypocrite is Muslim in appearance but he is merely a body without a soul, like the corpse of the dead. There is no body except there is a soul in it, but souls vary.

Beautiful speech! And speech of light from Imam Ibn Taymiyyah, *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi*.

This is the most appropriate opinion in this issue. That Faith and Islam are inseparable. And that if they come together they separate [in meaning]; Islam means apparent actions and Faith means hidden actions. But if each of them came [alone]... [if] Faith is mentioned absolutely, it means Islam. And if Islam is mentioned, it means Faith. Even he said if these other terms are mentioned: Islam, Faith, *Taqwa*; these synonyms if said alone, they include all these things together.

And we speak about Faith and Islam here as in the Hadith. He made Islam apparent actions and Faith hidden belief. This indicates their difference regarding Sharia reality. This is according to those who inferred that they differ as in the Hadith of Jibrīl.

There are also Hadiths ("Islam is built on five: Testimony that *Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*, establishing prayer, giving zakat, fasting Ramadan..."). These "Islam is built" meaning they are pillars of Islam. This indicated that there is no hidden Faith except with apparent Islam, and no apparent Islam except with hidden Faith. So this diversity even in Sharia address and diversity in evidences exists.

Therefore you find in the book *Jāmi' al-'Ulūm wa al-Ḥikam* by **Imam Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī** in his explanation of the Hadith of Jibrīl in detail these issues but in a brief way. And the book *Al-Īmān* by Ibn Taymiyyah is more detailed and comprehensive and diverse. But Imam Ibn Taymiyyah refutes in it the sects and refutes many things with their logic. But he who wants these issues briefly should read the explanation of the Hadith of Jibrīl by Imam Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī in *Jāmi' al-'Ulūm wa al-Ḥikam* or read the explanation of Imams in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* or in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* who explained the Hadith of Jibrīl in this issue.

So the relationship between Islam and Faith is as we said like this. Among *Ahl al-Sunnah* dispute exists. Even among other sects like *Ash'āriyyah* and so on, it is almost close but different to some extent in the connection between Islam and Faith according to *Ash'āriyyah*. But among *Ahl al-Sunnah* as I told you we have two opinions: An opinion of **Synonymity**, and that Islam is Faith whether they came together in a text or separated or Islam was mentioned alone or Faith alone, they are synonymous. This is what Imam Al-Bukhārī and Imam Al-Marwazī and Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Mandah see.

As for the other opinion among *Ahl al-Sunnah* too, it is that there is an opinion **Differentiating** between Islam in its meaning as apparent matter and the other as hidden matter in appellation. That Islam is the Word and Faith is the Action. A group of the *Salaf* are upon this like Imam Al-Zuhrī and others.

But the **Third Opinion**, and it is a famous *Madhhab* also among the *Salaf*, is **Detailing (*Tafṣīl*)**. If they come together, Islam and Faith are inseparable; there is no Islam without Faith nor Faith without Islam, this is a fact. And that they are, as Ibn Taymiyyah says, like the Soul with the Body. There is no living soul without a living body. If the body is found, which is Islam, with a hypocrite, know that it is like the body of the dead without a soul. Therefore we say if they come together, their meaning is different; Islam is apparent actions, and Faith means hidden belief. But if they separate, each of them encompasses the other.

Naturally among the **Ash'āriyyah**, the issue... they did not agree on it. A big dispute occurred among them. Some of them said Synonymity between them like *Ahl al-Sunnah*. And some of them said Differentiation (*Taghāyur*). And each team has deductions exactly like *Ahl al-Sunnah* in this issue. And they have details in this issue. The author of *Jawharat al-Tawḥīd* mentioned these issues, and **Sheikh Ibrāhīm al-Laqqānī** mentioned them in his explanation of *Jawharat al-Tawḥīd*. He spoke about these issues in detail. And Imam Al-Juwaynī and others mentioned them.

Meaning all this is in the books of *Ash'āriyyah*. And that Faith and Islam are different in essence and concept, with the saying of their inseparability textually (*shar'an*) in existence. Meaning there is no Muslim who is not a believer, just as it is impossible for a believer to exist who is not a Muslim, with the difference of the two realities of Faith and Islam.

Naturally this is the same difference existing among *Ahl al-Sunnah*. Some of them said they are united and synonymous as **Al-Subkī** said in *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah al-Kubrā*. Also the same dispute that occurred among *Ahl al-Sunnah*. Therefore they say Synonymity and Differentiation. Because Allah the Exalted says:

إِنَّ الْمُسْلِمِينَ وَالْمُسْلِمَاتِ وَالْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَالْمُؤْمِنَاتِ

"Indeed, the Muslim men and Muslim women, the believing men and believing women..." [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 35]

And the saying of Allah the Exalted:

وَمَا زَادَهُمْ إِلَّا إِيمَانًا وَتَسْلِيمًا

"And it increased them only in faith and submission." [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 22]

And they interpret the word *Taslīm* (submission) meaning Islam. And that Jibrīl when he came to teach religion asked the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* about each of them separately, and the Prophet answered each with an answer. So they inferred also with the Hadith of Jibrīl. Meaning the stance of the *Ash'āriyyah* is similar to the stance of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in this issue.

I am abbreviating very severely because I want to finish the course and we do not need another lecture. But two lectures will remain, *in shā' Allāh*, so I finish these issues combined. Because the next lecture, *in shā' Allāh*, we will speak about **Nullifiers of Faith** and refuting some doubts, and this is very important. And after that there will be a lecture in the end in which we speak about **Stating the Madhhab of the Salaf** in this issue.

The Issue of Imam Abū Ḥanīfah and the Murji'ah of Jurists:

However, an issue remains which is regarding the issue of **Imam Abū Ḥanīfah** and the controversy raised around him. **Was Imam Abū Ḥanīfah a Murji'?** And is he from the **Murji'ah of the Jurists** (*Murji'at al-Fuqahā'*) who used to delay Action? Or on the creed of Jahm ibn Ṣafwān?

Naturally there are scholars who discussed this issue in the past. Among them is **Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī**. He was very severe against the Ḥanafīs and severe against Imam Abū Ḥanīfah. Among the oddities is that the Ash'ari Ḥanafīs sanctify the two Imams; Imam Abū Ḥanīfah and Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī, and have very great attributes for them although they are Ḥanafīs. We told you these *Ash‘āriyyah* are in all schools; meaning in Mālikīs, Shāfi‘īs, and very little in Ḥanbalīs, but most Islamic schools are influenced by Ash'arism especially the late ones.

But what is noteworthy is that Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī, to whom the *Ash‘āriyyah* are attributed and who died year 330 AH[27], was in hostility with the Ḥanafīs and with followers of Imam Abū Ḥanīfah. He even counted them when he spoke about sects of *Murji'ah*: "**The Ninth Sect of the Murji'ah: Abū Ḥanīfah and his companions.** They claim that Faith is Knowledge of Allah and Acknowledgment of Allah and Knowledge of the Messenger and Acknowledgment of what came from Allah in general without explanation."

And he mentioned a narration, he said: "Abū ‘Uthmān al-Adamī mentioned that Abū Ḥanīfah and ‘Amr ibn Abī ‘Uthmān al-Shammarī met in Mecca. So ‘Amr asked him and said to him speech I do not want to repeat because it is speech of utmost danger and very severe. And Allah knows best the chain of this narration. It contains vilification of Imam Abū Ḥanīfah." And he commented and said: "**And Abū Ḥanīfah did not make anything of the Religion extracted [as] Faith. And he claimed that Faith is not partitioned, nor increases nor decreases, and people do not vary in it.** As for Ghassān and most companions of Abū Ḥanīfah, they narrate from their predecessors that Faith is Acknowledgment, Love for Allah, Glorification of Him, Awe of Him, and leaving disdain of His right, and that it does not increase nor decrease."

Naturally, Imam Ibn Taymiyyah in the book *Al-Īmān* leans towards the view that Imam Abū Ḥanīfah in the issue of defining Faith defines it according to the definition of Jahm in this issue.

Some scholars tried to find a solution and justify. And Sheikh the investigator **Muḥyī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd** *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi* tried to find that perhaps they intend **Linguistic Irjā’**. He defended this article in his commentary on the speech of Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī. He spoke in it about *Murji'ah*, *Khawārij*, *Qadariyyah*, and *Jabriyyah*. Then he tries in the end regarding applying the saying of *Irjā’* to Imam Abū Ḥanīfah, he said: "Not on the customary terminological meaning according to the

[27] Died 324 AH.

theologians. And Abū Ḥanīfah *raḥimahullāhu* is not a Murji' from any of the four classes of *Murji'ah*. And those who applied this term to him did not intend by it its customary meaning but intended the linguistic meaning which is Delaying (*Ta'khīr*)."

Naturally, this speech... in reality Imam Abū Ḥanīfah truly, and this is agreed upon even among his companions and the *Māturīdiyyah* are the most following people because they are the ones who follow Imam Abū Ḥanīfah and he is their Sheikh, and *Māturīdiyyah* are all Ḥanafīs, Imam Abū Ḥanīfah, yes, used to delay Action, and did not see the pillar-status (*rukniyyah*) of Action in Faith. Meaning Faith for him is only one thing: Affirmation or Acknowledgment only. Even Acknowledgment according to Imam Abū Ḥanīfah means Acknowledgment for conducting worldly rulings. Meaning you say: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*) and acknowledge "I am a believer" just so worldly rulings run upon you. But if he died and did not utter this word but he is a believer in his heart affirming this Islam and recognizing it, it means he died a believer. This is the issue.

Some of them said: No, Imam Abū Ḥanīfah is considered among the **Murji'ah of the Jurists** in this chapter. *Murji'ah* of the Jurists who used to delay Actions; a team of them considered Action not a pillar of Faith, and they named them "**Murji'ah of the Sunnah**." So they consider Abū Ḥanīfah *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* of this type.

In any case, Imam Abū Ḥanīfah... whether one said he is from *Murji'ah* of Jurists or that Faith for him is mere Heart Belief only or Knowledge only according to the definition of Jahm ibn Ṣafwān... And some late ones and some Ḥanafīs said: No, Faith according to Abū Ḥanīfah means Acknowledgment by Tongue and Belief by Heart (*Janān*). Because this is the famous opinion also among Ḥanafīs and *Ash'āriyyah*.

But they tried to find a solution for this, because the issue contained vilification of Imam Abū Ḥanīfah at that time. But Imam Abū Ḥanīfah frankly differs from all these. For Imam Abū Ḥanīfah, even if he held that view, the man was striving, and was enjoining good, and was forbidding evil. And naturally he supported some revolutions and was harmed and put in prison in the days of Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr, and the man died in prison.

Meaning the man was working and striving and was not nullifying and opening issues that it is merely Faith in the heart and people play and spread corruption in the land. But unfortunately, these definitions opened a great ruin upon the Ummah later. Because they are what opened after that the appetite of all sects of *Murji'ah* and those who nullified Jihad, because they left the pillar-status of Action. Meaning Action is not a pillar of Faith.

To the degree that some of these *Murji'ah* even in late eras made the issue of **Wala' and Bara'** (Loyalty and Disavowal), even supporting disbelievers... meaning one supports disbelievers and allies with them, they said this is a believer, and there is nothing in him. Why? Because Faith for them is only Heart Belief. So Wala' and Bara' has no value for them from the practical perspective. Because you can ally with enemies and support them, because this is Action, so Action is not from Faith.

Therefore this opened [the door] that people spy, commit destructive sins, and can do acts of *Kufr*. Why? Because a human, if he did these deeds, as long as he believes in his heart, he is a believer! This is the secret of the occurrence of this ruin. And unfortunately this is famous among *Ash'āriyyah* also and *Māturīdiyyah* and others. Therefore you find that when one allies or supports [disbelievers], they do not declare him disbeliever nor apply these terms to him because they believe Faith is Heart Belief. The utmost you find from the righteous among them, they say Belief is evidence and effect and is not in itself a disbelieving operation. "This is evidence that he did something of *Kufr*," meaning based on Heart Belief only. So who knows Heart Belief?!

This is what the **Murji'ah of the Era** now did, who made Action not a pillar or that it is merely a **Condition of Perfection** (*Sharṭ Kamāl*), not a condition of validity nor obligation nor even a pillar. Whether those who consider it a pillar or consider it a condition of validity or condition of obligation. Meaning even if we conceded it is a condition of validity or condition of obligation, because a condition of validity or condition of obligation is like one who did not perform ablution because it is outside prayer, meaning the Condition is outside the thing. If I did not perform ablution and prayed, even if I prayed and performed pillars, my prayer is invalid, because ablution is stipulated. So if we calculated that Action is a condition and not a pillar of Faith, meaning Pillar is inside the thing itself, even if we took it by terminology like this, in the end this will result in invalidity too.

Like Prayer in itself; tranquility, standing, all this is called a Pillar inside the prayer itself and not outside it.

But Imam Abū Ḥanīfah for example in his book *Al-Fiqh al-Akbar* and in his refutation of the *Jahmiyyah* in his era declared them disbelievers. He declared disbelievers those who say (*The Most Merciful rose over the Throne*) [that] He did not Rise. He sees Highness, contrary to all these late *Ash'āriyyah* who do not see that, and their creed is built on war against the issue of Highness.

And Imam Abū Ḥanīfah whom they glorify sees Highness and believes in this. He has opinions even in some Names and Attributes he is on the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*, but he opposed them in the issue of Faith.

Meaning the error here with Imam Abū Ḥanīfah is that he erred in the issue of Faith, he is not on the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah* in the issue of Faith. He is a great Imam from the Imams of this religion and from Imams of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, from the major Imams of scholars of this religion. But in this issue he erred and he is not infallible. He erred in his *Ijtihad* in this issue and in his definition of Faith.

And the speech of Shaykhul-Islām frankly is the correct one in this issue, contrary to those who tried to defend and justify. Imam Abū Ḥanīfah, none of his followers disagree, said **Faith does not increase nor decrease**. And Imam Abū Ḥanīfah **does not make Exception** in Faith. This is also from the creed of Jahm because they do not make exception in Faith, and Faith for them is Affirmation or Knowledge only. So Imam Abū Ḥanīfah does not say Faith increases and decreases, and this is by their admission and admission of commentators and admission of great Imams. Even Imam Abū Ja'far al-Ṭaḥāwī *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* tried to clarify that the dispute is verbal and the issue is like this. But in the end Imam Abū Ḥanīfah says Faith does not increase nor decrease, and does not make exception in Faith.

This is the speech also of the *Māturīdiyyah*, followers of the Ḥanafīs and followers of Imam Abū Ḥanīfah in this issue.

So **Summary**:

The least estimation and least description is that Imam Abū Ḥanīfah *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* was a **Murji'** in the issue of Faith, and that he used to say Faith does not increase nor decrease. Some said increases but does not decrease, but the famous correct view about him is he said it does not increase nor decrease. And we told you the speech of Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī when he said about him that he says, he and his companions, that Faith does not increase nor decrease; does not partition nor increase nor decrease nor do people vary in it. Meaning the faith of individual people is like the faith of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* or faith of angels.

Imam Abū Ḥanīfah died year 150 AH and was a great Imam and has followers and writings. It does not mean because he agreed with the *Ash'āriyyah* in the issue of Faith that he agrees with them in other issues. Rather he opposed them in other issues. And he has no relation to the *Ash'āriyyah* in meaning, because when he died year 150 AH, Imam Abū

al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī was not born basically nor was in the loins of his fathers basically. Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī died year 330 AH[28], difference between him and the Imam is a century and a half.

Therefore they used to say Abū Ḥanīfah is Ash'ari and Al-Bukhārī is Ash'ari and Muslim is Ash'ari and all these are Ash'aris. This is false speech. Yes, agreed in some issues, does not mean they agreed like this. In the issue of defining Faith only. And Imam Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī himself is the one who attacked Abū Ḥanīfah and mentioned him with severity.

Naturally Imam **Ibn Ḥazm** has very severe speech on Abū Ḥanīfah in these issues, and on the *Ash'āriyyah* he was very severe on them and his speech is of utmost harshness on them. But we, with fairness, said this is a great Imam, *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi*. And practically, he was not complicit nor did he rely on rulers. He refused the position of judiciary in the Caliphate State. On the contrary, he used to incite as he did with Ibrāhīm and Muḥammad in the revolution in Basra and supported people in Medina. So naturally here he was tortured and imprisoned considering he incites the Talibis against the Abbasids. These are known issues in history.

So the man was tested and patient and harmed and did not assume even the position of judiciary, and did not benefit from his knowledge as others benefited. Rather his followers are the ones who benefited frankly, like Abū Yūsuf and other scholars. As for him, he did not benefit and refused this.

Thus, his life from the practical perspective is a life closer to the life of the Righteous *Salaf* and to the sound methodology. But from the foundational theoretical perspective in the chapter of Faith, he opposed the Righteous *Salaf* and opposed the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah* and opposed the understanding of the Companions in this issue. He opposed in defining Faith with its **Three Pillars**: Belief by Heart (*Janān*), Speech by Tongue, and Action by Pillars (*Arkān*). And Action by Pillars or Action of Limbs is Action of Limbs and Action of Heart. And Speech by Tongue and Speech of Heart and Action of Heart. Meaning these three combined. And these pillars, three, are that by which a man is called a believer.

In shā' Allāh, we suffice with this amount in this subject. In the next lesson, *in shā' Allāh*, we will try to refute some doubts and speak about **Nullifiers of Faith** or Nullifiers of Islam, and come to some Hadiths and refute some doubts raised by some.

[28] 324 AH.

And we will speak about the issue: What is intended by the Action whose abandonment entails *Kufr*, and what is called the issue of **Genus of Action** (*Jins al-'Amal*). And we give an example on the issue of **Abandoning Prayer** and opinions of scholars in the issue of abandoning prayer and some other rulings.

We ask Allah the Great, Lord of the Great Throne, to enlighten us and teach us what benefits us.

And may Allah bless you and reward you with all good..

Wa al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh..

The Tenth Lesson

Refutation of Doubts:

Verily, all praise is due to Allah; we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allah from the evils of our souls and our bad deeds. Whomever Allah guides, there is no one to misguide him, and whomever He leads astray, there is no guide for him. I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, alone with no partner, and that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ تُقَاتِهِ وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُم مُّسْلِمُونَ

"O you who have believed, fear Allah as He should be feared and do not die except as Muslims." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 102]

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُم مِّن نَّفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا وَبَثَّ مِنْهُمَا رِجَالًا كَثِيرًا وَنِسَاءً ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا

"O mankind, fear your Lord, who created you from one soul and created from it its mate and dispersed from both of them many men and women. And fear Allah, through whom you ask one another, and the wombs. Indeed Allah is ever, over you, an Observer." [QS. An-Nisā’: 1]

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَقُولُوا قَوْلًا سَدِيدًا * يُصْلِحْ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ ۗ وَمَن يُطِعِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيمًا

"O you who have believed, fear Allah and speak words of appropriate justice. He will [then] amend for you your deeds and forgive you your sins. And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has certainly attained a great attainment." [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 70-71]

To proceed:

The most truthful speech is the Book of Allah, and the best guidance is the guidance of Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. And the worst of matters are their innovations, and every innovation is a heresy (*bid‘ah*), and every heresy is a misguidance, and every misguidance is in the Fire.

Honored brothers, here we are with the twenty-second day of the month of Muḥarram for the year 1433 of the blessed Prophetic Hijrah. We are also with the **Tenth Lesson** of a Sharia course titled: *Masā'il fī al-Īmān* (Issues Regarding Faith).

Today we will speak about the **Doubts** raised by the *Irjā'iyyūn* (proponents of *Irjā'*) and other sects who expel actions from the appellation of Faith. For they have doubts and a trace of knowledge on which they rely, so we will refute some of these doubts.

We have discussed some of their doubts before, and Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah refuted them in the past in some issues, like the doubt of Faith meaning Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*) linguistically and so on. But now we will refute some **Hadiths** which they raised. Especially since there is a team from the people of *Irjā'* who are a group of contemporaries whom governments care about and pay much attention to, inciting them to ridicule the People of Truth and distort the truth. Although there are warnings from the Council of Senior Scholars in the Land of the Two Holy Mosques against these people whom I will point to later, *in shā' Allāh*. Yet they still have a very large influence and impact on the youth. They are essentially worshippers of *Ṭāghūts* (tyrants), their mouthpieces, their protectors, and their supporters, although they claim to be people of knowledge or attributed to knowledge!

Therefore, we will speak today, *in shā' Allāh*, about these doubts. I had said before that we would speak about **Nullifiers of Islam** (*Nawāqiḍ al-Islām*) or Nullifiers of Faith (*Nawāqiḍ al-Īmān*). And I said before: When I speak about Nullifiers of Faith, it means I speak about Nullifiers of Islam. Therefore, *in shā' Allāh*, I will postpone the issue of Nullifiers of Faith and Nullifiers of Islam if there is remaining time in this lecture.

The issue of Nullifiers of Islam is present and spread in books. Shaykhul-Islām Muḥammad ibn ʻAbd al-Wahhāb *raḥimahullāh* spoke about it in *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah*, and you will find he wrote it in what is called "The Ten Nullifiers." These nullifiers are present in Volume 10 of *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah*. Some scholars undertook its explanation, and you will find it easy, available, and praise be to Allah. Also the conditions of *Lā ilāha illā Allāh* and nullifiers of *Lā ilāha illā Allāh* mentioned by the author of *Maʻārij al-Qabūl*, Sheikh Ḥāfiẓ al-Ḥakamī *raḥimahullāh*.

Also, some old books spoke about these nullifiers and spoke about words of *Kufr* (disbelief) in themselves, whether sayings or actions in detail. Even from the scholars of *Ashʻāriyyah*, like Imam Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī al-Shāfiʻī who died in the year 973 AH. He has the book *Al-Iʻlām bi Qawāṭiʻ al-Islām* in which he gathered words of *Kufr*. It is a book of

utmost strength, although we know that Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī *raḥimahullāh* was very extreme in issues of Sufism and his Ash'arism, and attacked Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah a lot. But in any case, this book is of utmost strength and utmost benefit.

It is an argument (*ḥujjah*) even against the people of *Irjā'*; because he mentioned things in sayings and actions. If there is remaining time we might read some texts. It is a refutation of those who expel actions from Faith and say a human does not disbelieve by them. There are also books by some Imams like the book *Risālah fī Alfāẓ al-Kufr* by one of the Shāfi‘ī scholars, Al-Qāsim ibn Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Khānī. Although he is a fundamentalist Sufi, he died in the year 1109 AH and has this valuable book in its field, gathering words in it. Naturally, he benefited from the writings of Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī, who is Shāfi‘ī too. Naturally, the Ḥanafīs are among the scholars most concerned with issues of words of *Kufr*. There is a treatise also on words of *Kufr* by Tāj al-Dīn ibn Mas‘ūd al-Ḥanafī, and a treatise also present by Badr al-Dīn al-Rashīd wa ‘Alī al-Ḥanafī died year 768 AH in words of *Kufr*.

Even the book *Al-Shifā'* by Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ contains good and very strong issues in issues of *Kufr* and rulings of apostasy. And the book *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* by Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, and fatwas of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā*. Also there are contemporary books. There is a valuable book which is a PhD thesis by Dr. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Laṭīf, a printed book named: *Nawāqiḍ al-Īmān al-Qawliyyah wa al-‘Amaliyyah*. It is a valuable book in its field. In addition to the book *Al-Jāmi‘ fī Ṭalab al-‘Ilm al-Sharīf* which spoke on this, containing very strong issues.

So contemporary and old books are available, praise be to Allah, in issues of rulings of apostasy. Even in chapters of Fiqh, and in all chapters of Fiqh entirely from all schools, Mālikīs, Shāfi‘īs, Ḥanbalīs, and Ḥanafīs, all of them, you find therein "The Book of Apostasy" or "Chapter of Apostasy," speaking in detail about words and rulings and what expels the Muslim servant from Faith. Unfortunately, no one pays attention to them nor adheres to them in these days of ours.

So this introduction was intended to clarify that I will postpone the issues of Nullifiers of Faith to the end of the lecture; because I will focus now on the doubts raised by these *Murji'ah*, especially the contemporaries.

And I mention as I said and from the words of Imam **Al-Ājurrī**, because his speech is very clear. He died in the year 360 AH. In his book *Al-Sharī‘ah* he says: "Chapter: The saying that Faith is Affirmation by the heart, Acknowledgment by the tongue, and Action by the limbs: One is not

a believer unless these three qualities are combined in him." Until he said: "Know, may Allah have mercy on us and you, that what the scholars of Muslims are upon is that Faith is obligatory upon all creation, and it is Affirmation by the heart, Acknowledgment by the tongue, and Action by the limbs. Then know that Knowledge by the heart and Affirmation do not suffice unless there is with it Faith by the tongue in speech. Nor do Knowledge by the heart and Speech by the tongue suffice until there is Action by the limbs. So if these three qualities are complete in him, he is a believer."

Then he inferred regarding that from the Book and Sunnah, then said: "So actions, may Allah have mercy on you, by the limbs are a confirmation (*taṣdīq*) of Faith by the heart and tongue. So whoever does not confirm Faith by the action of his limbs, such as purification, prayer, zakat, Hajj, jihad, and the likes of these, and is satisfied for himself with knowledge and speech, is not a believer, and knowledge and speech do not benefit him. His abandonment of action is a denial (*takdhīb*) by him of his faith. And action according to what we mentioned is a confirmation (*taṣdīq*) by him of his faith. And with Allah the Exalted is success."

Then he said after that: "And know, may Allah have mercy on us and you, that I have perused the Qur'an and found in it what I mentioned in fifty-six places in the Book of Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*: That Allah *Tabāraka wa Ta'ālā* did not admit believers into Paradise by Faith alone, but admitted them into Paradise by His mercy upon them and by what He granted them success to perform of Faith in Him and Righteous Action. This is a refutation of whoever said Faith is Knowledge. And a refutation of whoever said Faith is Knowledge and Speech even if he did not act. We seek refuge in Allah from the sayer of this."

Then he reviewed the evidences in detail. This introduction is very important because it clarifies for us the summary of the belief of the *Salaf*.

We begin now with some Doubts, because the subject is long and requires greater study, but we summarize and simplify the issues.

First Thing: Those who expelled Action from the appellation of Faith have a doubt: They inferred with the Hadith of **Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān** *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* and it is a known and famous Hadith. This Hadith was narrated by Ibn Mājah in *Kitāb al-Fitan*. This Hadith has an authentic chain (*Isnad Ṣaḥīḥ*), and Al-Albānī extracted it in the book *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Mājah* and testified to its authenticity.

So this Hadith, the Hadith of Ḥudhayfah, we say it as it appeared in *Sunan Ibn Mājah*: He says after citing his chain from Rib'ī ibn Ḥirāsh from

Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān who said: "The Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ʿalayhi wa sallam* said: ('Islam will wear out as embroidery on a garment wears out, until no one will know what fasting, prayer, rites, and charity are. The Book of Allah *ʿAzza wa Jalla* will be taken away in a night, so not one verse of it will remain on earth. And there will remain groups of people, the old man and the old woman, saying: "We caught our fathers upon this word: *Lā ilāha illā Allāh*, so we say it.'"). Ṣilah said to him: 'What good will *Lā ilāha illā Allāh* do them when they do not know what prayer, fasting, rites, and charity are?' Ḥudhayfah turned away from him. Then he repeated it to him three times, all that time Ḥudhayfah turning away from him. Then he turned to him on the third time and said: 'O Ṣilah! **It saves them from the Fire**,' three times." Or as he said, as in *Sunan Ibn Mājah*. This Hadith was also narrated by Al-Ḥākim in his *Mustadrak* and he indicated it and said: "Authentic Hadith according to the condition of Muslim, and they did not extract it." Imam Al-Dhahabī agreed with him on that.

And Ibn Ḥajar said in *Al-Fatḥ* about the narration of Ibn Mājah: "Its chain is strong." And naturally Sheikh Al-Albānī followed the authentication of Imam Ibn Ḥajar and Al-Dhahabī and said it is authentic and mentioned it in *Al-Silsilah al-Ṣaḥīḥah* and in his book *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Mājah*.

So this Hadith is the doubt of these people. They relied on the fact that this Hadith indicates a human enters Paradise even if he did not work. These people do not know what fasting, rites, and charity are. The witness is his saying: They do not know except *Lā ilāha illā Allāh* only, meaning this saves them. This is the argument of the *Murji'ah* who said: *Lā ilāha illā Allāh* suffices even if he did not bring even the genus of action (*jins al-ʿamal*), and did not do good at all. And these do not know what prayer, fasting, charity, and rites are. All this is what they relied upon in this Hadith.

And Sheikh Al-Albānī relied on this Hadith in his commentary in *Al-Silsilah al-Ṣaḥīḥah* when he considered it a jurisprudential benefit: "That the testimony of *Lā ilāha illā Allāh* saves its sayer from eternal abiding in the Fire on the Day of Resurrection, **even if he does not perform anything of the other five pillars of Islam.**"

The contemporary *Murji'ah*, these people, always rely on the opinions of Sheikh Al-Albānī in these issues, especially in issues of Faith; because the Sheikh considers actions a condition of perfection (*sharṭ kamāl*) and not a condition of validity (*sharṭ ṣiḥḥah*) nor a pillar in Faith.

So they understood from the Hadith that whoever says: "*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*" it saves him from eternal abiding in the Fire on the Day of

Resurrection even if he does not perform anything of the five pillars of Islam.

Naturally, **Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah** in the book *Al-Īmān* refuted this doubt too. Although they have read the speech of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah and they publish his books and know that, but Glory be to Allah... because the problem with them fundamentally is that they are **Worshippers of Ṭāghūts**, frankly! And they want to decorate for people... This is the whole story around which they turn and twist!

Why do they insist on expelling actions from the appellation of Faith? And why do they insist that *Kufr* is only by heart belief, and that *Kufr* by action is merely minor *Kufr* (*Kufr Aṣghar*) and *Kufr* less than *Kufr*?! All this to justify for the *Ṭāghūts* who command people with these legislations other than what Allah revealed, and enslave people and rule them with man-made laws, and commit polytheistic acts (*shirkiyyāt*) and acts of disbelief (*kufriyyāt*). All this to justify for the *Ṭāghūts* that as long as they say (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*), it saves them, and that these issues are at most practical *Kufr*, meaning *Kufr* less than *Kufr*. All this twisting and turning is flattering these rulers who have exited Islam.

Even this Hadith of Ḥudhayfah, which is ("Islam will wear out as embroidery on a garment wears out, nothing remains of Islam"). Meaning it almost became extinct, nothing of its teachings exists, finished. Because he said: ("Until no one will know what fasting, prayer, rites, and charity are").

They positioned this Hadith as contradicting the ruling of the *Salaf* which I mentioned to you in the speech of Imam Al-Ājurrī. Naturally I did not want to read all the speech of Imams, but this suffices us; the speech he mentioned regarding the ruling of the abandoner of the **Genus of Action** (*Jins al-'Amal*). These people believe the matter is contrary to this. They see that whoever abandons even the genus of action, does not pray, does not fast, does not give zakat, does not give charity, nor any of the pillars... Even Sheikh Al-Albānī said it: "Even if he does not perform anything of the other five pillars of Islam, even if he dies upon that, he is a believer"!

This is a wrong understanding of this Hadith. Had they returned to the refutations of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah and others, and even the scholars of the Najdi Da'wah in the past, had they returned to such refutations, they would not have raised them anew.

And notice in the end of the Hadith when he said: "Ṣilah said." Meaning Ṣilah, the narrator of the Hadith, marvels when he asks Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu*. So Ṣilah said to him: "What

good will (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*) do them when they do not know what prayer, fasting, rites, and charity are?" Ḥudhayfah turned away from him. So why did Ṣilah find it strange and marvel? Because the concept among the *Salaf* and these Successors is: How is it conceived that one enters Paradise and (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*) alone saves him?! Therefore he marveled and asked him, saying how [can it save them] while they do not pray nor fast? They do not conceive that one says (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*) and does not pray nor give charity nor give zakat nor establish pillars. So Ṣilah was marveling based on what was established in his creed and what he received from the Companions, so he asks Ḥudhayfah about that. Thus we must not neglect this part.

The other point regarding this Hadith is that the Sheikh *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* said: "Saves its sayer from eternal abiding in the Fire on the Day of Resurrection even if he does not perform anything of the five pillars of Islam."

The Hadith says: "Islam will wear out as embroidery on a garment wears out until no one will know what fasting, prayer, rites, and charity are. And the Book of Allah—*'Azza wa Jalla*—will be taken away in a night, so not one verse of it will remain on earth. And there will remain groups of people, the old man and the old woman, saying: 'We caught our fathers upon this word: *Lā ilāha illā Allāh*, so we say it'."

So there is no issue of eternal abiding in the Fire here. These people are in a stage of the stages of extinction of Islam. He says: "We caught [our fathers upon] this word." Imagine people who lived in blind ignorance to the degree they were born and knew nothing except this word they took from their fathers. They told them "You are Muslims and (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*)," and they know neither prayer nor fasting. So this is **Excuse by Ignorance** (*'Udhr bi al-Jahl*).

They are excused. And regarding these excused ones, how do you say about them that it saves them from eternal abiding in the Fire [implying they enter it first then exit, or applying rulings of negating deeds to capable people]? The Hadith indicates that the reason for that is **Ignorance**. In their time there is nothing. They are incapable people (*'ājizūn*). They know nothing of knowledge except this: (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*). Actions vanished entirely; they do not know what prayer or fasting is. Ignorance prevailed and spread such that nothing remained except this which they believe.

So these are excused even by the concept of the Sheikhs of *Irjā'* and Sheikh Al-Albānī. Yet they are the people drumming most on this issue, because they say the abandoner of the genus of action, even the unexcused one... Meaning one for example grew up in the environment of Muslims,

grew up in Mecca, grew up in Medina, grew up in Egypt; a country with knowledge and Islam, and Islam is still taught, and knowledge is widespread until now, despite the dominance of disbelieving laws from rulers but knowledge still exists.

So if one did not pray and did not perform the five pillars according to them in the state of non-ignorance, they say it saves them! "So you in normal life in Muslim lands say: ('Whoever says *Lā ilāha illā Allāh* enters Paradise')." They come to general Hadiths and do not specify them, while they have other specifiers in other Hadiths. But in the end they come to this and say it saves them. Meaning they come to a person living in Mecca, not praying, not fasting, not giving zakat, not doing anything; he says as long as he has (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*) this saves him even if he never did good and even if he did not perform these pillars while living in Muslim lands!

But the Hadith speaks about a period where Islam, nothing remained of it! A period comes where Islam became extinct, people do not know what fasting or prayer is. And the old man and old woman say "We caught our fathers," imagine! They say this word, meaning nothing remained of them except this! So you apply this Hadith to our contemporary reality, to people living in countries with scholars and Sharia rulings still remaining, and people knowing the meaning of prayer, meaning of fasting, meaning of *Ḥudūd*, and meaning of what is known of religion by necessity; they know that well. And you say if he said (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*) it saves him or he affirmed (*ṣaddaqa*), according to their method of defining Faith! Because Faith for them is: Affirmation by *Janān* (Heart), and Acknowledgment by Tongue, and Action for them is a condition of perfection, an ornament only, no more no less.

Even Acknowledgment by Tongue is only for them by way of conducting rulings only, meaning just so worldly rulings run. But if he died, according to the opinion of extremists among them, while his appearance in the world is that he did not acknowledge so rulings of disbelievers run upon him; but if he died and his heart acknowledges this religion and he did not utter it and did not do anything, he is a believer too! This is falsehood, slander, and fabrication against all these witnesses from the Qur'an and Sunnah.

So this Hadith with which they infer indicates that these people were incapable of action, due to the prevalence of ignorance in the period they live in, and nothing reached them of this religion except: (*Lā ilāha illā*

Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh). So it saved them because this is the extent they know.

But we come to a person who knows (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*) and has widespread knowledge, and you tell me that if he did not perform the pillars and did not work, it saves him and he enters Paradise and is a believer?! No, he is not a believer. Rather this is a disbeliever, a disbeliever outwardly and inwardly. This is what the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah* and Righteous *Salaf* is upon, *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhim*.

This doubt is in the manner of (*Did they recommend it to one another?*) [QS. Al-Dhāriyāt: 53]. They still indoctrinate their followers with this doubt, which is the doubt of this Hadith ("Islam will wear out as embroidery on a garment wears out"). And Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah has very beautiful speech in this matter.

I spoke in a previous lesson when we were speaking about expelling action. Imam Ibn Sallām refuted that in his book *Al-Īmān* as I told you. But Ibn Taymiyyah summarized this subject for us too, he said: "**When Allah sent Muḥammad as a Messenger to creation, the obligation upon creation was affirming him, affirming him in what he reported, and obeying him in what he commanded. He did not command them at that time with five prayers, nor fasting the month of Ramadan, nor pilgrimage to the House, nor did he forbid alcohol and usury for them.**"

Meaning when the Messenger was in Mecca in his beginning, he did not command them with these things, nor requested five prayers nor fasting Ramadan nor Hajj nor was alcohol even forbidden nor usury either. This was in the beginning.

"**Nor had most of the Qur'an been revealed.**" The Qur'an in the shadow of this Meccan period, the Qur'an was not revealed entirely. There were those who were believers and died while being believers with complete faith at that time, although the Qur'an's revelation was not completed, and although Sharia rulings did not descend at that time and were not completed until they were completed there in Medina.

Ibn Taymiyyah says: "**And the person was then a believer with complete faith**, the one in the Meccan period, **upon whom it was obligatory even if it was the like of that faith.**" Although alcohol was not forbidden, usury was not forbidden, prayers were not five, there was no obligation of zakat nor fasting Ramadan nor otherwise, and he died while being of complete faith.

"**So after the Hijrah when people migrated to Medina, nothing of what was before was accepted from them after that. And had one**

restricted himself to it, he would be a disbeliever." If one said: "I in Medina will remain on the old way, that usury is lawful, and that in Mecca alcohol was lawful, so I will consume alcohol and drink alcohol and make it lawful." Or said: "I will not pray the five prayers because they were not obligatory in Mecca and I believed since the days of Mecca." Would that be accepted from him? It would not be accepted from him and he became a disbeliever by this.

So the first one who died before Hijrah is a believer with complete faith. And the one who did not perform these rulings after that, after their revelation, becomes a disbeliever if he restricted himself only to what was there.

This is a silencing refutation from Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah. And before him the one who refuted that also is Ibn Sallām *raḥmatullāhi ʿalayhi*.

I will mention to you some evidences like the **Hadith of Al-Uṣayrim**, he did not prostrate a single prostration to Allah, did not bow a single rak'ah to Allah. But one accepted Islam immediately and said: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*) and raided with the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ʿalayhi wa sallam* and was killed. He did not bow and did not pray, but he performed what was upon him at the moment. He said the word, and it is an action too, because the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ʿalayhi wa sallam* said: "He did little work and was rewarded much." **He worked** because he went to fight Jihad, and Jihad is action.

The only action he did is this. If he lived and said "I sufficed with Jihad and I am now a retired Mujahid! And I will now be seated and will not fight Jihad and will not pray and once is enough for me," and the matter ended. Would the man whom the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ʿalayhi wa sallam* praised be praised by the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ʿalayhi wa sallam* if he lived and said "I will suffice with the first time and the matter is over" without excuse?

Thus, this is the extent that accommodates these people in the Hadith ("Islam will wear out as embroidery on a garment wears out"); that these were in blind ignorance, or that this time will be at the extinction of Islam, and spread of ignorance, and these are incapable people. These are sheikhs, an old man and old woman saying "We caught our fathers upon this word!" They do not know what prayer is nor anything. So they are excused by their incapacity, and excused by their ignorance, because this is what was in their time.

This is the doubt which these people frequently mention and indoctrinate their followers with regarding this issue. This Hadith has many details and other refutations, but I am summarizing as much as possible regarding this Hadith. Because I have some other doubts.

There is also a doubt in the **Hadith of Intercession** (*Shafā‘ah*), or the Hadith of what is called the "Jahannamiyyūn" (Hell-people) who exit from the Fire and never did any good. The Hadith of Intercession was narrated by Imam Muslim in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* in the Book of Faith completely, and it is a very long Hadith. I will summarize the Hadith and try to come to the witness in it. The Hadith was narrated by Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* when some people asked the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*: "Will we see our Lord on the Day of Resurrection?" The Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: ("Yes"), then he cited a very long Hadith until he reached the issue of Intercession.

We come to the witness which the contemporary Neo-Murji'ah cited, or the worshippers of *Ṭāghūts* who changed and replaced the rulings of Islam with man-made rulings and laws for which Allah sent down no authority. He says in the Hadith as in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: "Then Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla* says: The angels have interceded, the prophets have interceded, and the believers have interceded, and none remains except the Most Merciful of those who show mercy. So He seizes a handful from the Fire and brings out from it a people who never did any good, who had turned into charcoal. Then He casts them into a river at the mouths of Paradise called the River of Life. So they come out as a seed comes out in the silt of the torrent. Do you not see it being towards the sun yellowish or greenish, and what is towards the shade being white?"

They said: "O Messenger of Allah, as if you used to herd in the desert." He said: "So they come out like pearls, on their necks are rings. The people of Paradise recognize them: These are the emancipated ones of Allah whom Allah admitted into Paradise without any deed they did nor any good they presented. Then He says: Enter Paradise, whatever you see is yours. They say: Our Lord, You have given us what You did not give anyone of the worlds. So He says to them: I have something better than this. They say: O our Lord, what thing is better than this? He says: My Pleasure (*Riḍā*), so I will never be angry with you after it."

This is the witness in this Hadith as in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, which is the Hadith of Intercession. Naturally, it is among the strongest evidences on which they rely. Because He says: "They never did any good"! It is a Hadith they call the Hadith of the Jahannamiyyūn, the exit of these who were in

the Fire and Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* brought them out while they never did any good.

Naturally, this witness they cited in the Hadith of the Jahannamiyyūn or Hadith of Intercession... Scholars, even Ibn Taymiyyah and others—and the one who refuted this Hadith before Ibn Taymiyyah, before he was even born, is Imam **Ibn Khuzaymah** *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* in *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*.

These people of innovation, as we said, always rely on general Hadiths and evidences and intentionally neglect the specific ones. Ibn Taymiyyah *raḥimahullāh* refuted this speech which they thought was the irrefutable argument for expelling Actions from the appellation of Faith. They said this is proof for that, that these people entered Paradise and were brought out from the Fire without ever doing any good. This is what they argued with, that the genus of actions is not disbelief.

But this speech was said by Imam Ibn Khuzaymah *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* and he clarified it in *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*, he said: "**This —meaning 'never did any good'— is in accordance with what the Arabs were accustomed to and used in their speech regarding denying the name from a thing due to its deficiency from perfection and completeness, not due to its negation completely.**" He says: This is according to the prevalent usage. "Never did any good," this runs according to the prevalent speech among Arabs meaning negating perfection.

Therefore the Hadith as in *Sunan al-Nasā'ī* and Aḥmad and Ibn Ḥibbān and Al-Ḥākim, and the Hadith's origin is in the Two *Ṣaḥīḥs*, this phrase: ("Never did any good"), is in another Hadith they infer with but it is against them too, which is the **Hadith of the man who never did any good and used to lend to people**.

This Hadith was extracted by Al-Nasā'ī in his Book of Sales (*Buyū'*). He mentioned this Hadith with his chain from Zayd ibn Aslam from Abū Ṣāliḥ from Abū Hurayrah *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu* from the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* who said: "Indeed a man never did any good, and used to lend to people and say to his messenger [servant]: 'Take what is easy and leave what is difficult and overlook, perhaps Allah the Exalted will overlook us.' When he perished, Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* said to him: 'Did you ever do any good?' He said: 'No, except that I had a servant and I used to lend to people, so when I sent him to collect I said to him take what is easy and leave what is difficult and overlook, perhaps He will overlook us.' Allah the Exalted said: 'I have overlooked you.'"

Notice this Hadith is against them; because the Hadith says: ("Never did any good"), yet he used to lend to people, and was an easy man, pardoning the insolvent, and lenient in his debts. Therefore Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* treated him by overlooking his bad deeds because he used to overlook the insolvent, although he was "never did any good" in the wording of the Hadith. Its interpretation is that this is **General** (*‘Āmm*).

The phrase ("Never did any good") is general, either specified (*yukhaṣṣaṣ*) in the same Hadith or specified by another Hadith, or specified by a verse, or specified by other contextual evidences. These are ABC issues present and studied in books of *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* regarding the Specific and General. Do they need us to teach them *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*?! They study and know and are people of knowledge and know that well. But I told you:

فَإِنَّهَا لَا تَعْمَى الْأَبْصَارُ وَلَكِن تَعْمَى الْقُلُوبُ الَّتِي فِي الصُّدُورِ

"For indeed, it is not eyes that are blinded, but blinded are the hearts which are within the breasts." [QS. Al-Ḥajj: 46]

Because they decorate for these rulers to do whatever they wish of falsehood and acts of disbelief, claiming that this is *Kufr* less than *Kufr*, and that the appellation of Faith does not include Action, and Action is merely a condition of perfection and not a condition of validity, and that it suffices you that (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*) saves you. And the proof for that is this, that Allah will admit people into Paradise who never did any good!

So here is the Hadith of Al-Nasā’ī from Abū Hurayrah that a man never did any good and used to lend to people and overlook the insolvent. And this was his argument before the Lord of the Worlds on the Day of Resurrection that he used to overlook people, so Allah overlooked him. Thus, is this overlooking good or not good?! Good. And the Hadith says "never did any good." Does this overlooking of the insolvent include types of righteousness and good or is it not from good? It is from types of good.

So these are general phrases. Meaning the intent is that these people, bad deeds were predominant over them, but not regarding perfection nor completeness as Imam Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq ibn Khuzaymah *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi* said in *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*. And this was also refuted by Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in detail, all found in the book *Al-Īmān*.

This argument that "they never did any good" is proof that Action is not a condition of validity nor a pillar and that (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*) suffices a human even if he never did any good... We said to them: No, this

is false speech! And this is speech not permissible to rely upon. And there are other Hadiths against this.

They know the Hadith in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* in the Book of Prayer, what is called the **Hadith of the one who prayed badly** (*Musī' Ṣalātahu*). This Hadith when the man entered the mosque and prayed, then the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said to him: "Go back and pray for you have not prayed." Then he returned. He said: "Go back and pray for you have not prayed." So he returned and in the end said: "I do not know better than it." So the man prayed! Meaning the form of the posture is that he prayed; he stood, bowed, prostrated, acted, and recited. He brought it from Takbir to Taslim. Yet despite that the Messenger negated the validity of prayer from him.

And Imam Abū 'Ubayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* in his book *Al-Īmān*, this is his argument. He inferred in refuting them regarding "they never did any good" that we take the predominant, and these are specified expressions. And when the Messenger said "Go back for you have not prayed," the Messenger saw him praying actually, but he negated from him the validity of prayer, this is not the correct prayer.

They say in the Hadith: "Never did any good *qaṭ* (at all)", the word *qaṭ* is proof of emphasis. So here is the Hadith of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* that he returned to him and said to him three times: "Go back and pray for indeed you (*fa-innaka*) have not prayed." *Fa-innaka*: (*Inna*) emphasizing. A definitive assertion that he did not pray, although the man had prayed.

So we say ("never did any good"), they did not reach that mostly, but they do good. And proof for that is that a human can do good but evil was predominant over him so it is said to him he did not do good. Negating all goodness from him.

And the Hadith of the man who used to lend to people and overlook the insolvent is an argument in this too. For the man, with the same wording and same emphasis as in *Sunan al-Nasā'ī*, that he never did any good, yet he used to overlook. Thus, does "never did any good" include the word that he overlooks? Is it from good or not from good?! And how do we know it is from good? That Allah pardoned him and said when He heard his argument: ("I have overlooked you"). So Allah overlooked him and admitted him to Paradise because of this; because he used to do good but mostly he used to do bad deeds and did not do good absolutely [in perfection].

So this phrase from the linguistic perspective and from the perspective of words of action is a **General Phrase** intended to be Specific, specified by these Hadiths. Therefore Ibn Taymiyyah always focused on this, that the problem of these people is that they infer with generalities. These people of innovation infer with generalities and do not rely on specification. Meaning the Hadith is specified in another situation and they rely on the general.

And this subject that the word of Tawhid (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*) is with its conditions and nullifiers. (*Lā ma‘būda bi-ḥaqqin illā Allāh*) with its conditions and nullifiers.

We will prove that with other evidences, *in shā’ Allāh*.

We come to another doubt from this same context, which is the doubt of: **The Hadith of the Card** (*Biṭāqah*).

The Hadith of the Card is also among the Hadiths they relied upon. Imam Al-Tirmidhī mentioned it in his book *Al-Īmān*. It is a Hadith from ‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhumā* who said: The Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: "Allah will select a man from my nation at the heads of creation on the Day of Resurrection. He will spread over him ninety-nine scrolls (*sijill*), every scroll like the extent of vision. Then He says: 'Do you deny anything of this? Did My scribes, the preservers, wrong you?' He says: 'No, O Lord.' He says: 'Do you have an excuse?' He says: 'No, O Lord.' He says: 'Yes, you have a good deed (*ḥasanah*) with Us, for there is no injustice upon you today.' So a card (*biṭāqah*) comes out in which is: *Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa ashhadu anna Muḥammadan ‘Abduhu wa Rasūluhu*. He says: 'Bring your weight.' He says: 'O Lord, what is this card with these scrolls?' He said: 'You will not be wronged.' He said: So the scrolls are placed in a pan, and the card in a pan. The scrolls became light and the card became heavy, for nothing is heavy with the Name of Allah."

This Hadith, Imam Al-Tirmidhī said about it: "Hasan Gharib Hadith," and it is in his book *Al-Īmān*. And *Biṭāqah* here means as Al-Tirmidhī himself said, it means a piece (*qiṭ‘ah*). Meaning like a piece on which things are written or a patch (*ruq‘ah*).

So this Hadith of the Card is similar to the previous one, a general Hadith. This man to whom (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*) came and became heavy in his scale... they say he said (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*) and it outweighed his scrolls. They did not mention to us what is this in the scrolls? It might mean these are scrolls of sins Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* pardoned him for. And this man might be excused, might have grown up in ignorance, like the

Hadith of the old Sheikh and the Hadith of those growing up in periods of spread of ignorance etc., or growing up in a beginning, or the like of these, or committing sins of minor sins so they are pardoned.

This Hadith "never did any good" is stronger in inference than the Hadith of the Card on which they relied. For they are general Hadiths contradicted by these witnesses and Hadiths. I told you the words of Al-Ājurrī that he recalled from the Qur'an fifty-six places regarding Faith linked to Action. There is no human who enters Paradise except by the mercy of Allah the Exalted and by His granting success to this Action; without action he does not enter Paradise like this. And that these Hadiths speak about special cases; that there is extinction and Islam wears out and vanishes and nothing remains of it. So such Hadiths, yes, it applies to them whoever said (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*) sincerely from his heart or truthfully enters Paradise. Yes, this is in cases of extinction and cases of spread of ignorance and that he knows nothing but this, so it saves him in this case.

Naturally they have other doubts. But in addition to what we told you before regarding such Hadiths, Sheikh **Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb** *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* in *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah* mentioned very beautiful things in refuting those who expel Actions from the appellation of Faith and consider that whatever disbelieving acts this person who says (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*) commits, and did not do anything, it suffices him. He is a believer and Muslim and nothing harms him; these sins do not harm him nor these major sins, even if he committed Shirk with Allah.

Therefore he inferred against them with about six evidences. The summary of what he mentioned:

First thing, he clarifies to us from reality, from the merits of this school; the school of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, and Ibn al-Qayyim, and these unique scholars and Imam Aḥmad before, and after him Al-Ājurrī, and before them the great Imams like Ibn Sallām and Al-Bukhārī and Abū Zur'ah and others. All these were clear in their evidences and their recalling of evidences.

Notice Sheikh Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* when he clarified to them the **First Image of Practical Apostasy**. We are speaking that the issue is you say that whoever said (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*) entered Paradise and this suffices. So come from the practical applied perspective: Come to the generation of the **Companions**, how did they deal with one who expels actions or one who did not come with

actions? You say that this man is a believer even if he abandoned these actions or committed these disbelieving things.

First thing, after mentioning many evidences, he mentioned among these the **Case of Apostasy** (*Riddah*). After the death of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*, sects apostatized. A sect returned to worshipping idols, and said "Had he been a Prophet he would not have died." A sect said "We believe in Allah but do not pray." A sect acknowledged Islam and prayed but withheld Zakat. A sect testified that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah but believed **Musaylimah**. Meaning they said the Prophet associated him in Prophethood. They had proof and established witnesses for that. Meaning they brought a man who had believed and said he was with the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* then apostatized, they call him **Al-Rajjāl**. So they believed him and he told them "Yes, Muḥammad associated him with himself," meaning Musaylimah is a prophet with the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. And this man was diligent in worship and knowledge.

And this "Al-Rajjāl" is spread a lot in our days too. You will find these "Rajjāl" among those famous for worship and knowledge. How many are they now! These are like the Madkhalis and Jāmis and Jawāmīm and all worshippers of *Ṭāghūts*. We will mention some names of them by way of disparaging them and not listening nor reading books of these and warning against them, *in shā’ Allāh*.

So these had a doubt too, that there is someone who testified to them that the Messenger associated Musaylimah with himself in Prophethood, *wal-‘iyādhu billāh*.

And a people from the people of Yemen among the sects of Apostasy too believed **Al-Aswad al-‘Ansī** in the claim of Prophethood. And a people believed **Ṭulayḥah al-Asadī**.

And none of the Companions doubted the disbelief of those we mentioned, and the obligation of fighting them, except the **Withholders of Zakat**. Meaning all these they declared disbelievers and did not doubt their disbelief. The only case where dispute occurred is the case of Withholders of Zakat.

Meaning the sects of Apostasy entirely, the Companions had no problem with them. And they did not say such stupid excuses, and these stupid provocative precautions they say: "Did you ask him? Was he denying in his heart? Is he making it lawful (*mustaḥill*)? Is he this?" The

Companions did not ask them these questions which these worshippers of *Ṭāghūts* invented.

The only case in which the Companions *riḍwānullāhi 'alayhim* debated with Abū Bakr is the case of Withholders of Zakat. They said when Abū Bakr resolved to fight them: "How do you fight them while the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* said: ('I have been ordered to fight the people until they say *Lā ilāha illā Allāh*. If they say *Lā ilāha illā Allāh* they have protected from me their blood and wealth except by its right')?" Naturally Imam Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb abbreviates the Hadith, and the Hadith is in the Two *Ṣaḥīḥs*.

Subhan Allah, these people of *Irjā'* as I said know this Hadith, and read it well. "They said *Lā ilāha illā Allāh*, as long as they said it they protected their blood and wealth except by its right." This discussion took place with the Companions and took place with Abū Bakr and the matter ended and **Consensus** (*Ijmā'*) occurred. Why do you oppose the Consensus?! And oppose the consensus of the Ummah.

Abū Bakr said: "**Zakat is from the right of *Lā ilāha illā Allāh*. By Allah, if they withheld from me a hobbling-rope (*'iqāl*) they used to pay to the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* I would fight them for withholding it.**"

Then the doubt was removed from the Companions, and they knew that Allah had expanded Abū Bakr's breast for fighting, and knew the obligation of fighting them. So he fought them and Allah granted them victory over them. So they killed whom they killed and took their women and children captive.

These were performing the five pillars except Zakat. Meaning they stipulated regarding the issue of Zakat only and they had (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*). Meaning believers from this aspect. Despite that, he declared them disbelievers and judged them with apostasy and fought them, Abū Bakr and the Companions, and it was a consensus. So he declared them disbelievers based on **Action** although they had (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*).

So these want to expel Action from the appellation of Faith, yet Abū Bakr declared them disbelievers and judged their apostasy and fought them and permitted their abodes and women and wealth.

Therefore Sheikh Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb says: "Contemplate this story which Allah made among His care for His creation until the Day of Resurrection. So whoever contemplates this a good contemplation, especially if he knows that Allah made it famous on the

tongues of the common people. And the scholars agreed on the correctness of Abū Bakr in that, and considered among his greatest virtues and knowledge that he did not hesitate to fight them at the first instance. And they recognized the abundance of his understanding in his inferring against them with the evidence that confused them. So he refuted them with their evidence itself, although the issue is clarified in the Qur'an and Sunnah."

This is proof of the superiority of Abū Bakr and that he is the most knowledgeable of them in Fiqh *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* and the most learned. No one compares to Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq, he is a nation in himself. And our master Abū Hurayrah and others in their beautiful speech: "Had it not been for Abū Bakr in his war against the apostates, Islam would have become extinct and Islam would have been lost."

As for the Qur'an, His saying the Exalted:

فَاقْتُلُوا الْمُشْرِكِينَ حَيْثُ وَجَدتُّمُوهُمْ وَخُذُوهُمْ وَاحْصُرُوهُمْ وَاقْعُدُوا لَهُمْ كُلَّ مَرْصَدٍ ۚ فَإِن تَابُوا وَأَقَامُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتَوُا الزَّكَاةَ فَخَلُّوا سَبِيلَهُمْ

"Then kill the polytheists wherever you find them and capture them and besiege them and sit in wait for them at every place of ambush. But if they should repent, establish prayer, and give zakat, let them go on their way." [QS. At-Tawbah: 5]

And in the Two *Ṣaḥīḥs* that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* said: "I have been ordered to fight the people until they testify that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah, and establish prayer, and give zakat. If they do that, they have protected from me their blood and wealth except by the right of Islam, and their reckoning is upon Allah."

Notice this address. Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* says: (*But if they should repent, establish prayer, and give zakat*). Meaning it does not suffice that he says (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*) and does not conduct the rulings. Action is necessary. Allah wanted Faith and wanted Action, as I told you in the debate of Imam Abū Thawr with the *Murji'ah* regarding such verses.

So these are the deductions mentioned also by Shaykhul-Islām Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb. But there is more than that. He inferred also with stories in history. He inferred for example with the story of **Banū Ḥanīfah**. This is what is called a field study from historical reality. This realistic study is a realistic induction of realistic incidents in history that happened in the time of the Companions. Meaning he refutes them: How

did the Companions understand the Qur'an and Sunnah and they are the ones who received it? And how did the Successors understand, who took these Sharia sciences from the Companions?

Banū Ḥanīfah are followers of Musaylimah the Liar. These apostatized. But when they were overcome, and a remnant of Banū Ḥanīfah remained, they returned to Islam. They said "We testify that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah," and disavowed Musaylimah and acknowledged his lying. And they considered their sins great in themselves, and went with their families for *Ribāṭ* (guarding frontiers) and for Jihad in the path of Allah, hoping that would erase that apostasy from them. Because Allah the Exalted says:

إِلَّا مَن تَابَ وَآمَنَ وَعَمِلَ عَمَلًا صَالِحًا فَأُولَٰئِكَ يُبَدِّلُ اللَّهُ سَيِّئَاتِهِمْ حَسَنَاتٍ

"Except for those who repent, believe and do righteous work. For them Allah will replace their evil deeds with good." [QS. Al-Furqān: 70]

So righteous action is necessary.

وَإِنِّي لَغَفَّارٌ لِّمَن تَابَ وَآمَنَ وَعَمِلَ صَالِحًا ثُمَّ اهْتَدَىٰ

"But indeed, I am the Perpetual Forgiver of whoever repents and believes and does righteousness and then continues in guidance." [QS. Ṭāhā: 82]

This group submitted and repented from apostasy, and after that fought Jihad and took their families and fought Jihad at the frontiers. Then they settled in Kufa in Iraq, so they had a known quarter there for Banū Ḥanīfah, and in it a mosque called Mosque of Banū Ḥanīfah. Some Muslims passed by their mosque, and they were gathering in it between Maghrib and Isha. So he heard speech meaning that Musaylimah is on the truth. They are a large group, and the one speaking was one saying "Musaylimah was on the truth," and all of them were sitting in the mosque and their number was large. No one of those sitting denied this saying. So this man reported, and they raised their affair to **'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd** *raḍiyallāhu 'anhu*.

So 'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd gathered those he had of the Companions *raḍiyallāhu 'anhum* and consulted them: Should he kill them even if they repented or ask them to repent? Some indicated killing them without asking

repentance, and some indicated asking them to repent. So he asked some to repent, and killed some and did not ask him to repent, and killed their scholar **Ibn al-Nawwāḥah**. There was a Sheikh for them, this Ibn al-Nawwāḥah, he killed him with them merely upon a report that came to Ibn Mas‘ūd that one of the people testified against them. So they were brought, he raided their mosque and interrogated them. He asked repentance from those he asked, and there are those he killed without asking repentance, and he killed their scholar Ibn al-Nawwāḥah.

Sheikh Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb says: "Contemplate, may Allah have mercy on you. If they had shown of difficult righteous deeds what they showed, when they disavowed Kufr and returned to Islam, and nothing appeared from them except a word they concealed in praising Musaylimah but some Muslims heard it... Yet with this, no one hesitated in the disbelief of all of them; the speaker and the one present who did not deny. But they differed only: Is their repentance accepted or not?" Meaning after they overpowered them, is their repentance accepted or not. This story is present in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*.

He said: "**So where is this compared to the speech of one who claims to be from the scholars and says about the Bedouins, who do not have a hair of Islam with them?**" Meaning those who were in the days of Sheikh Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb. These do not have a hair of Islam except that they say *Lā ilāha illā Allāh*. "**Where is this compared to what the Companions agreed upon regarding whoever said that word or attended it and did not deny.**" Meaning this is a group that said a word and it was not denied, yet they judged them all with disbelief. So what about those who have nothing of Islam; grave worshippers, do not pray, do not give zakat, do not fast, stubborn, turning away... yet you say he is Muslim?

And he also inferred against them with an incident that occurred in the time of the Rightly Guided Caliphs from the story of the companions of ‘Alī *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* when they believed divinity in him, meaning the **Saba’iyyah** who said "You are God." Here our master ‘Alī ordered burning them. He says: "So he dug trenches for them and filled them with firewood and ignited fire in them and threw them in it while they were alive. And it is known that the disbeliever like the Jew and Christian, if Allah ordered killing him, it is not permissible to burn him with fire."

Because ‘Alī *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* saw that this punishment suits these who were Muslims. He said: "**Know that they are more severe in disbelief than Jews and Christians. This, while they stand the night in prayer, fast the day, and recite the Qur'an, taking it from the Companions of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*.**

Yet when they exaggerated regarding ʻAlī, he denounced the exaggeration, and burned them with fire while they were alive. And the Companions and scholars entirely agreed on their disbelief. So where is this compared to one who says regarding the Bedouins that saying, while acknowledging this story and its likes and acknowledging that the Bedouins disbelieved in Islam entirely except that they say *Lā ilāha illā Allāh*?" He says these committed a crime against Divinity. As for those who assaulted with a crime against Prophethood and who claimed Prophethood and insulted, they were deprived of this.

Therefore he says: "**Indeed the crime of these is against Divinity and we did not know in them a crime against Prophethood. And those before them, their crime was against Prophethood and we did not know for them a crime against Divinity. This clarifies to you something of the meaning of the Shahādatayn which are the origin of Islam.**"

Then Shaykhul-Islām mentioned after that another story which happened also in the time of Companions and Successors, which is the story of **Al-Mukhtār ibn Abī ʻUbaydillāh al-Thaqafī**. This is a man from the Successors and his story is famous. I mentioned it in detail when we were speaking about the **Group of Tawwābīn** (Penitents) and that he deceived a group of Tawwābīn, in a large study named *Jamāʻat al-Tawwābīn wa al-Radd ʻalayhā*.

This man was righteous in his beginning, and was a jurist scholar from a Mujahid family. He is from the Successors and was an in-law to ʻAbdullāh ibn ʻUmar, meaning married one of his daughters, and manifesting righteousness. He appeared in Iraq demanding the blood of Al-Ḥusayn and his family (*Ahl al-Bayt*). He is the one who killed ʻUbaydullāh ibn Ziyād who killed Al-Ḥusayn *raḍiyallāhu ʻanhu*. Therefore people loved him and inclined to him. He said he demands the blood of *Ahl al-Bayt* from those who oppressed them and seized Iraq. He manifested the rituals of Islam and appointed judges and Imams from the companions of Ibn Masʻūd. And he was the one leading people in prayer and Jumuʻah. But in the end of his affair he claimed that revelation comes to him! We ask Allah for safety.

So ʻAbdullāh ibn al-Zubayr sent an army to him, defeated his army and killed him. The commander of the army was Muṣʻab ibn al-Zubayr. So Muṣʻab called them to declare him disbeliever. Meaning the one who defeated them was our master ʻAbdullāh ibn al-Zubayr at that time, he was considered Commander of the Faithful in the Islamic world at that time. The Islamic world was divided into two parts: A part with Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam and his son ʻAbd al-Malik ibn Marwān after that. And ʻAbdullāh

ibn al-Zubayr remained over Mecca, Medina, Egypt, most of the lands of Shām, the Two Holy Mosques, and Yemen. All these lands up to the borders of the land of Sindh, all these places pray for him as Commander of the Faithful. And [Marwān's rule] was not but a patch of land only in Damascus and Jordan. Then after that the famous story happened when ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Zubayr *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* was killed and his kingdom was taken and he was defeated due to very many things. But the witness here is that he was Commander of the Faithful for nine years.

So he sent an army led by his brother and killed Al-Mukhtār al-Thaqafī. His wife was arrested, and she is the daughter of a Companion. Muṣ‘ab called her to declare him disbeliever, but she refused. He said to her: "This man is a disbeliever, testify that he is a disbeliever." She refused and rejected to declare her husband who was killed disbeliever. So he wrote to his brother ‘Abdullāh asking him for a fatwa regarding her. He wrote to him: "If she does not disavow him, kill her." She refused, so Muṣ‘ab killed her.

He said: "**And the scholars entirely agreed on the disbelief of Al-Mukhtār despite his establishing the rituals of Islam, because he committed a crime against Prophethood. If the Companions killed the woman who is one of the daughters of Companions when she refused to declare him disbeliever, then how about one who does not declare the Bedouins disbelievers —meaning those in the era of Shaykhul-Islām Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb— while acknowledging their condition? Then how about one who claimed they are people of Islam, and [claimed] that the one calling them to Islam is the disbeliever?!**"

The fifth evidence also with which he inferred is from a story that occurred in the time of the Successors, the story of **Al-Ja‘d ibn Dirham**. He was among the most famous people in knowledge and worship. Notice he infers on the practical side that these were scholars and people of knowledge, yet despite that they declared them disbelievers and were not satisfied that they said *Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh* that it saves them. Rather they said they are disbelievers. On the contrary, they asked people to disavow them. One asks his wife to disavow him and say he is a disbeliever, and they killed her for that.

The Fifth Evidence: "What happened in the time of the Successors (*Tābi‘īn*), which is the story of **Al-Ja‘d ibn Dirham**. He was among the most famous people for knowledge and worship. Yet when he denied something of the Attributes of Allah *‘Azza wa Jalla* despite it being a hidden saying to most people, Khālid al-Qasrī, who was the Governor of Iraq at that time, sacrificed him on the day of Eid al-Aḍḥā. He said: 'O

people, offer sacrifices, may Allah accept your sacrifices from you, for I am sacrificing Al-Ja'd ibn Dirham; for he claims that Allah did not take Abraham as a close friend (*Khalīl*) and did not speak to Moses directly (*Taklīm*).' Then he came down and slaughtered him. We do not know anyone of the scholars who denounced that; rather Ibn al-Qayyim in his *Nūniyyah* praised this act and approved it."

Evidence is also from the stories he inferred from realistic stories in the history of Islam and Muslims, and how scholars and Sheikhs and people of Islam applied these Hadiths. And regarding the issue of expelling Actions from the appellation of Faith, and from the practical perspective, that the person who says *Kufr* or whatever he has of (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*), it does not suffice him and he is judged with *Kufr*.

The story of **Banū 'Ubayd al-Qaddāḥ** who are called the Fatimids or 'Ubaydiyyūn: "For they appeared at the head of the third century. 'Ubaydullāh claimed he was from the family of 'Alī from the descendants of Fāṭimah, and dressed in the garb of obedience and Jihad in the path of Allah. So groups of people of the Maghreb followed him, and he had a large state in the Maghreb, and for his children after him. Then they possessed Egypt and Shām, and manifested the rituals of Islam, and manifested the laws of Islam and established Jumu'ah and congregation, and appointed judges and Muftis. But they manifested things of Shirk and opposition to Sharia, and there appeared from them what indicates their hypocrisy. **So the people of knowledge agreed that they are disbelievers, and that their abode is an abode of war (*Dār Ḥarb*).**"

This is a refutation of **Al-Zuḥaylī**, and refutation of **Al-Qaraḍāwī**, and refutation of **Al-Raysūnī**, and refutation of these defeated, crushed schools. And **Al-Juday'** who says dividing the inhabited world is an innovated division and no one knows that! Naturally this is another issue, I tried only to draw attention, because they do not say there is something called *Dār Islām* and *Dār Kufr*, and [they say] the abode is one abode in the world and these divisions do not exist and are all innovative. All this for the sake of defeatism.

Al-Zuḥaylī authored his book on the ruling of the people of war (*Ahl al-Ḥarb*) for them. Naturally they proceeded on this same crushed defeated system and said there is one abode. All this to please the United Nations, and please the West, and please all these sects and creeds, but they do not please Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā*. They do not fear Allah, they fear the United Nations. Therefore they said the abode is one abode. Who told you the abode is one abode? While the people of Egypt, scholars

judged upon them in their time that their abode is an abode of *Kufr* and war, despite their manifesting the rituals of Islam and its laws.

And Sheikh Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb says: "**So the people of knowledge agreed that they are disbelievers, and that their abode is an abode of war, despite their manifesting the rituals of Islam and its laws. And in Egypt there were many people among scholars and worshippers, and most people of Egypt did not enter with them into what they innovated. Yet despite that, the scholars agreed on what we mentioned.**" Meaning they agreed that Banū ‘Ubayd the rulers are disbelievers exiting the Millah and their abode is an abode of war. So the consideration is the **Dominance of Rulings** (*Ghalabat al-Aḥkām*), and it does not mean the populace is disbelieving. Because he says there are scholars and worshippers in it and most people did not enter with them, but they judged by the dominance of rulings.

He said: "**Yet despite that, the scholars agreed on what we mentioned. Even some of the major scholars known for righteousness said: 'If I had ten arrows, I would shoot one at the warring Christians and shoot nine at Banū ‘Ubayd.'**"

So the story of Banū ‘Ubayd... they were working and establishing judges and ruling by many things in Sharia, yet they judged them with *Kufr* and Apostasy. So what about our days?! You judge the government of current states: **Ḥusnī Mubārak** who perished, and the military came after him and inherited him. And these ruling the Islamic world in Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya. All this Islamic world... Even **Āl Sa‘ūd** who do not rule by Sharia basically and divide the religion, these who manipulate. How is this with these?!

On the contrary, if you compared Banū ‘Ubayd with Āl Sa‘ūd even, you would find they were more religious than them, and more respectful of religion than them.

These in our days... compare between them and Banū ‘Ubayd. Compare between those ruling Egypt now with man-made laws and these rulings for which Allah sent down no authority, and warring against Islam and mocking it, an organized war with the protection of armed gangs called the Army, Police, and Intelligence; apparatuses sponsoring this new idol, the man-made laws and man-made constitution for which Allah sent down no authority. And they made Islam a target to attack, mock, ridicule, marginalize, cocoon, and dwarf. And you compare between them? On the contrary, Banū ‘Ubayd were better than them in this case; they were ruling by the Sharia they believed in, and they were leaving some *Madhhabs* at least to judge by Shāfi‘ī and Ḥanafī and Māliki law sometimes.

As for these, it does not exist. Rather imported laws from France, America, Europe, West, and East. Despite that, he says no matter what they do, their rulings are *Kufr* less than *Kufr*, and practical *Kufr* is minor *Kufr*, and even if you calculate it as major *Kufr*, as long as he has (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*) it saves him from Hell! Meaning any ruler is given glad tidings; we give glad tidings to Zayn al-'Ābidīn, and Ḥusnī Mubārak, and the Generals in Algeria... all these we give them glad tidings that they are exempted now by the ruling of the Neo-contemporary *Murji'ah* and by the ruling of old extremist *Murji'ah* and these. These New *Murji'ah*, even these are like the extremists too.

Therefore Shaykhul-Islām mentions a story in the time of **Sultan Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī**. He sent a great army to the people of Egypt, so they took Egypt from the hands of the 'Ubaydiyyūn, and did not leave fighting them for the sake of the righteous people in it. Meaning they did not say "How do we enter it while righteous people are in it, and there are civilians, and women and old men, and *Fitnah* will happen, and this is fighting of *Fitnah* as happens in Iraq and others!" The man sent an army to invade them.

And Nūr al-Dīn Zankī when he sent this army led by Asad al-Dīn Shīrkūh and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī and those who went to Egypt to fight whom? Some women will be killed and old men, and a fierce war between two parties. And when they burned Al-Fusṭāṭ, and it remained more than sixty days with fire burning in it, and nations of humans were killed and died. And when this army entered, yes they clashed with them, and their Jihad... He did not say "There are righteous people in it so let us leave them so civilians do not fall!" When the Sultan conquered it, Muslims rejoiced greatly at that. And **Ibn al-Jawzī** authored a book on that naming it: *Al-Naṣr 'alā Miṣr* (Victory over Egypt). Intending the rulers of Egypt.

And most scholars in writings [spoke] of this speech regarding their *Kufr*. They wrote in the past despite our mentioning of apparent rituals of Islam. Meaning they were manifesting rituals of Islam, yet scholars declared them disbelievers in the past and rejoiced at the removal of their state at the hands of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī under the leadership of Nūr al-Dīn Zankī *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi*.

The last story is the story of the **Tatars**. Shaykhul-Islām Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb says: "That is because when they did to Muslims what they did and inhabited the lands of Muslims and knew the religion of Islam and approved of it and accepted Islam, but did not know what is obligatory upon them and showed things of exiting the Sharia, but they utter the *Shahādatayn* and pray." They are not like the Bedouins; the

Bedouins in the days of Sheikh Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb did not pray essentially, and worshipped stones and other things. Meaning the Tatars were better than them. "**Yet despite this, the scholars declared them disbelievers and fought them and raided them until Allah removed them from the lands of Muslims.**"

Meaning even these Tatars were saying (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūlullāh*) and praying, but they were adhering to the legislations of Genghis Khan's laws called **Al-Yāsiq**. Therefore Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah undertook refuting this doubt raised by these followers of Ibn ‘Arabī and Sufis and some beneficiaries from people of Sufism and collaboration and treachery at that time, who were allying with the Tatars. So Ibn Taymiyyah *raḥmatullāhi ‘alayhi* refuted all these and said to them: "**If you saw me in their army with the *Muṣḥaf* on my head, kill me.**" Ibn Taymiyyah was fighting the Tatars who accepted Islam, not the first Tatars who did not accept Islam. We are speaking about the period of Tatars who accepted Islam under Ghāzān and others and those who came after him.

So all this is a refutation of these relapsed worshippers of *Ṭāghūts* and worshippers of rulers, who decorate these doubts for these rulers and author books. And these books were spent on from the agenda of Intelligence, whether from the Intelligence of Āl Sa‘ūd or in Egypt or in other states. Books indulging in **Excuse by Ignorance**, such that Excuse by Ignorance became as if it is everything in religion. Although reality does not possess this issue... and it has other details I do not like to mention. But the witness is they authored books all pouring into the interest of rulers.

Therefore they are the apparatuses of Intelligence and the eyes of these rulers... the content of the claim of these people. Therefore they supported them and cooperated with them, like **Rabī‘ al-Madkhalī** and his followers and students. And look even at those who authored books in what is called "**Controls of Takfir**" (*Ḍawābiṭ al-Takfīr*) and so on. This is a treatise from the Permanent Committee for Scholarly Research and what is called the Council of Senior Scholars. This committee is formed by the State which they defend. Meaning they are more royalist than the King himself! Deviation and extremism reached with these people a very terrible way, to the degree that this Permanent Committee for Scholarly Research and Ifta in the Land of the Two Holy Mosques published a treatise warning against *Irjā’* and some books calling to it. A treatise printed and available, you can search for it on the Internet and find it. The treatise was to refute these senile worshippers of *Ṭāghūts* who are the evils of creation. Like this **Murād Shukrī** who wrote a treatise in his book *Iḥkām al-Taqrīr fī Aḥkām al-Takfīr*.

And also the book *Ḍabṭ al-Ḍawābiṭ* by one named **Aḥmad al-Zahrānī**. And also the book *Al-Ḥukm bi Ghayr Mā Anzal Allāh wa Uṣūl al-Takfīr* by this Murji' **Khālid al-'Anbarī**. And also the book *Ḥaqīqat al-Īmān bayna Ghuluww al-Khawārij wa Tafrīṭ al-Murji'ah* by a Murji' from the *Murji'ah*. Meaning truly the *Murji'ah* multiplied upon us!

These are **'Adnān 'Abd al-Qādir**, and also in the book *Al-Taḥdhīr min Fitnat al-Takfīr* by the Sheikh of the innovations of *Irjā'* and among the most lying of Allah's creation in our contemporary days, this malicious man named **Ḥasan 'Abd al-Ḥamīd**. And also there is a book *Hazīmat al-Fikr al-Takfīrī* by Khālid al-'Anbarī too, he has two books on that.

And the Council of Senior Scholars exposed these people and warned against their books and said they are extremists and they lied upon Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah. Meaning merely thieves, pretenders, liars, and fabricators. This group lives in Jordan, and some of it was in Syria, and some of them in the Kingdom (State of Āl Sa'ūd). And naturally they breed and multiply intellectually like the breeding of flies. You find for example **Sa'īd Raslān** in Egypt, he has a complex regarding Sayyid Quṭb *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi*, martyr of Islam. And you have also this **Al-Ḥajūrī** the Yemeni who cries for help and wails like women there while the Houthis besiege him, and these are worshippers of 'Alī 'Abdullāh Ṣāliḥ. And a malicious Murji' too, **Al-Farkūsī** [likely Al-Farkous] this one in Algeria. And also what is called **Ṭal'at Zahrān** this one in Egypt and others. There are many names, they became confusing to us due to their abundance.

Therefore some brothers asked me that in Tunisia now books of Sa'īd Raslān and some of these *Murji'ah* and Rabī' al-Madkhalī and so on... these books are placed in some mosques and others. These books must be removed from these mosques, they will lead to *Fitnah*. Because they mix truth with falsehood, and the common people and young youth cannot distinguish between truth and falsehood. These are liars, lying was proven upon them, and lying and fabrication was proven upon their Sheikh Rabī' al-Madkhalī. Meaning these are fabricators, liars, lickers of the boots of *Ṭāghūts*.

These are the ones who always focus on the issue of expelling Actions from the appellation of Faith. Notice the ancients, even the old *Ash'āriyyah* and even those who expelled Actions from the appellation of Faith, had chivalry (*murū'āt*), and used to fight Jihad and had much good. And even they are the ones who authored these books as I told you regarding Imam Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī in his book *Al-I'lām bi Qawāṭi' al-Islām*.

We present to you a model of what **Ibn Badr al-Rashīd** said in his book *Alfāẓ al-Kufr* (Words of Disbelief), and he is a scholar died year 860 AH. The man gathered things you marvel at. He says: "Whoever denied a verse from the Book of Allah the Exalted, whoever mocked the Qur'an or the Mosque or the like of what is magnified in Sharia, disbelieved. And whoever put his leg on the *Muṣḥaf* swearing mockingly disbelieved. Or denied a verse from the verses of the Book of Allah the Exalted disbelieved. Or refused something of the Qur'an or denied the *Mu‘awwidhatayn* in the Qur'an without interpretation disbelieved. And whoever denied a Surah disbelieved."

Very many things, verbal and practical. And things regarding which these people did not say for example "Did he intend *Kufr* or not?" Meaning putting his leg on the *Muṣḥaf*, "Did he believe in his heart, or does he believe, or is he making it lawful (*mustaḥill*), or not making it lawful?" This is as one of the scholars said in a treatise on *Alfāẓ al-Kufr*, **Tāj al-Dīn Abū al-Ma‘ālī Mas‘ūd ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz**. This one in his book stated textually and gathered and categorized very many things.

One says "If so-and-so was a prophet I would not have believed in him," he said: Disbelieves. If he said: "If the Qiblah became to this direction I would not pray to it," disbelieves. This is the choice of Imam **Burhān al-A’immah**. And if one said: "I wish to be a disbeliever," or wishes to marry a woman saying "I wish to disbelieve so I marry this woman," he said he disbelieves. Meaning if one intended *Kufr* immediately... meaning saying "I wish after ten years I disbelieve to marry so-and-so" or do anything, he disbelieves immediately. Meaning we do not wait and he remains Muslim until the ten years then see does he disbelieve or not disbelieve! Rather he disbelieves immediately by mere intention.

These are issues they gathered, sayings and actions and deeds gathered by scholars and they cared about them, which expel the human saying (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*) from Islam and he becomes an apostate. Read books of Fiqh, you will find in the book *Al-Mughnī* by Ibn Qudāmah in Volume 7 or 8 that he classified in the Book of Apostasy these sayings and words. And scholars, even Ḥanafīs and Shāfi‘īs and all these Imams and Mālikīs were very strict. And they have in Chapters of Apostasy speech of utmost importance but unfortunately it is not taught nor cared about.

Therefore these people placed these obstacles and these doubts. If a youth or anyone went to the books speaking about Apostasy and words of Apostasy and how a human exits Islam, they would place these conditions for which Allah sent down no authority. Like conditions of

Denial (*Juḥūd*) and **Heart Lawfulness** (*Istiḥlāl Qalbī*). And that *Kufr* is not except by Heart *Kufr* only and there is no Practical *Kufr*, and that he who disbelieves by action, this is merely *Kufr* less than *Kufr* and is minor *Kufr*. And that if a human died and committed these acts of *Kufr* too, he is a believer because Action is not a condition of Faith, rather it is a condition of perfection and not a condition of validity nor even a pillar of pillars.

Nullifiers of Islam:

Regarding the Nullifiers of Islam which we mentioned, I told you review them in the books I mentioned before. But so I conclude with them, *in shā' Allāh*, these Nullifiers mentioned by **Sheikh Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb** in *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah*, I will say them quickly. They clarify to you... "Nullifier" (*Nāqiḍ*) means demolisher. You say "he demolished the house" (*naqaḍa al-bayt*). So Nullifier of Islam is Nullifier of Faith. Meaning that does not benefit you, as if you were not [Muslim], you became something else, his ruling in Sharia is non-existent.

And these Nullifiers are not ten in meaning [of restriction]. Meaning this is *Ijtihad* from Sheikh Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb *raḥmatullāhi 'alayhi* and scholars of Najdi Da'wah. He strove to restrict them to ten, and maybe Nullifiers are three hundred, they are very many Nullifiers. Otherwise read the speech of Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī when he spoke in *Qawāṭi' al-Islām*, very many Nullifiers. And books of these whom I mentioned to you on words of *Kufr*, and those who gathered and cared about these things, you will find things and Nullifiers not even mentioned by Sheikh Muḥammad 'Abd al-Wahhāb. Because Sheikh Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb *raḥimahullāh* mentioned these basics, meaning the known Major [Nullifiers] he gathered. But it does not mean they are restricted. So let no one think they are restricted to ten, but he restricted them so people pay attention to them.

But notice these Conditions of (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*) and Nullifiers of (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*). Believe me, if you applied them to **Āl Sa'ūd** who claim religion, you would find that they have committed these Nullifiers. And all these governments in the world, you find them having committed them.

These Nullifiers, no one says they are innovations in speech. These Nullifiers are merely summaries and deductions from the Qur'an and Sunnah and Hadiths, therefore scholars explained them.

I say the Nullifiers without explanation. Sheikh Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb said: "**Know that among the greatest Nullifiers of Islam are ten: First:** Shirk in the worship of Allah the Exalted. Allah the Exalted

said: 'Indeed, Allah does not forgive that you should associate partners with Him, but He forgives what is less than that for whom He wills.' [QS. Al-Nisā’: 48]. And He said the Exalted: 'Indeed, he who associates others with Allah - Allah has forbidden him Paradise, and his refuge is the Fire. And there are not for the wrongdoers any helpers.' [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 72]. And from that is supplicating to the dead, and seeking aid from them, and vowing and slaughtering for them. **Second:** Whoever makes between him and Allah intermediaries, supplicating to them and asking them intercession and relying upon them, has disbelieved by consensus. **Third:** Whoever does not declare the polytheists disbelievers (*man lam yukaffir al-mushrikīn*), or doubts their disbelief, or corrects their *Madhhab*, has disbelieved."

The polytheists here might mean the original disbeliever, like Jews and Christians. Meaning when he says "I do not know are they Muslims or not," this one disbelieves immediately, and needs to bathe and testify the *Shahādatayn* anew. Like this man who said: "Pope Shenouda or Pope so-and-so, his father was, *raḥimahullāh*, a friend to me."

This one disbelieves immediately. Because (*Indeed, the religion in the sight of Allah is Islam*) [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 19], (*And whoever desires other than Islam as religion - never will it be accepted from him*) [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 85]. He knows it will not be accepted from him, and knows these are Sharia terms, and he is a scholar and not even a layman. And these are among things known from religion by necessity, even commoners are not excused in them, so what about scholars!

So whoever does not declare polytheists disbelievers or doubts their disbelief... But if there is dispute in the *Kufr* of one of them; a Muslim declared a person disbeliever and another did not declare him disbeliever, do we declare him disbeliever?! No. This ("Whoever does not declare the disbeliever a disbeliever is a disbeliever") is not taken absolutely, it is restricted. For example, you judged someone with apostasy and another scholar did not judge him with apostasy. Do we say because he did not declare disbeliever the one you declared disbeliever, he disbelieves?! No, this is wrong. The speech is not taken absolutely. This speech is regarding original disbelievers, or those about whom it became widespread that they are polytheists and a large group of scholars judged them or by consensus of scholars that they are polytheists. Like grave worshippers about whom they said they are polytheists. So in this case where the clarification is widespread, and scholars said they are polytheists.

Or one mocked Islam in front of you, one mocked the Messenger, and you say "No, I suspend judgment, I do not declare him disbeliever,"

you disbelieve in this case. How do you not declare disbeliever a man who has disbelieved? If the woman, because she did not declare her husband Al-Mukhtār al-Thaqafī disbeliever, and she was the daughter of ʻAbdullāh ibn ʻUmar, yet ʻAbdullāh ibn al-Zubayr asked her to repent and told his brother "Kill her if she does not disavow him!" So what about one who mocks the Messenger and mocks Islam?!

And these Christians who mock in Egypt, and these called Secularists mock day and night and ridicule Islam. Rather they ridicule the Messenger and ridicule this Qur'an, and you tell me "I suspend judgment in his *Kufr*"?!

Once one of the scholars, when a person said a word of utmost *Kufr* and declared *Kufr* openly, he said: "They have bad manners!" I know for the first time there is a Sharia ruling called "Bad Manners"! Meaning the man disbelieved, the man attacks Islam, the man insinuates and slanders, the man declares openly, you tell me "Bad Manners"?! This is playing with religion! Whoever sees this and hears in this situation and does not declare him disbeliever, disbelieves here.

And Ibn Masʻūd declared disbelievers even those who listened and did not deny from the remnants of Banū Ḥanīfah. He judged all of them: the speaker, the attender, the listener.

"**Fourth:** Whoever believes that the guidance of other than the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ʻalayhi wa sallam* is more perfect than his guidance, or that the ruling of other than him is better than his ruling, like those who prefer the ruling of *Ṭāghūts* over his ruling, he is a disbeliever."

Like those who say that these man-made laws are better and more suitable than the Holy Qur'an and more suitable than the Sunnah and more suitable than ruling by Islamic Sharia, and it is more appropriate for us and more suitable, or that it is equal! He who says these constitutions and legislations are better guided in path and better and consider people's interests, this one disbelieves with Major *Kufr* expelling from the Millah. And this is what is in all these governments. All these governments say this: "These laws are more suitable for our societies, this Sharia is not suitable now, Sharia will cause us *Fitnah*, Sharia will be a problem, there are minorities, etc."

"**Fifth:** Whoever hates something of what the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ʻalayhi wa sallam* brought, even if he acted upon it, has disbelieved; due to His saying the Exalted: 'That is because they disliked what Allah revealed, so He rendered worthless their deeds.' [QS. Muḥammad: 9]."

Even in the book *Alfāẓ al-Takfīr* he says: Whoever said "The heavy guest has come to us" intending Ramadan disbelieves. Imagine words like these! Scholars cared about these words because they found people became negligent, so they warned them and gathered for them such words.

"**Sixth:** Whoever mocks something of the religion of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* or its reward or its punishment disbelieves. The evidence is His saying the Exalted: 'Say, "Is it Allah and His verses and His Messenger that you were mocking?" Make no excuse; you have disbelieved after your belief.' [QS. At-Tawbah: 65-66]."

And how many are these! Satellite channels and stations and ridicule of Islam, and hosting these human wastes called Secularism and Marxism and Leftism. These ridicule Islam and Muslims day and night, and mock Qur'anic verses and mock the apparent guidance of Muslims. This is a Nullifier among Nullifiers, this applies to these people. Whoever mocked **something**! Merely a thing, not all the religion.

"**Seventh:** Magic (*Siḥr*), and included in it is *Ṣarf* (turning away) and *‘Aṭf* (inclining). Whoever did it or was pleased with it disbelieved. The evidence is His saying the Exalted: 'But they do not teach anyone unless they say, "We are a trial, so do not disbelieve."' [QS. Al-Baqarah: 102]."

This issue of Magic needs big clarification, and there are those who clarified it in their explanations.

"**Eighth:** Supporting the polytheists and assisting them against the Muslims. The evidence is His saying the Exalted: 'And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them. Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people.' [QS. Al-Mā’idah: 51]."

This is a very important Nullifier among Nullifiers of Islam. And it is what is called **Wala' and Bara'**. These governments that ally with enemies of Allah and disavow monotheists and disavow Muslims and disavow believers; this applies to them. This applies to individuals and groups and everything. This is what is called **Supporting the Polytheists** (*Muẓāharat al-Mushrikīn*).

"**Ninth:** Whoever believes that some people are permitted to exit from the Sharia of Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* is a disbeliever; due to His saying the Exalted: 'And whoever desires other than Islam as religion - never will it be accepted from him, and he, in the Hereafter, will be among the losers.' [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 85]."

Like Sufis and extremists, he says to you: "We sufficed and reached the stage of Ecstasy (*Wajd*) and Contemplation."

"**Tenth:** Turning away (*I'rāḍ*) from the religion of Allah, not learning it nor acting by it. The evidence is His saying the Exalted: 'And who is more unjust than one who is reminded of the verses of his Lord; then he turns away from them? Indeed We, from the criminals, will take retribution.' [QS. Al-Sajdah: 22]."

These are the Nullifiers. Sheikh Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb says: "**There is no difference in all these Nullifiers between the Jester, the Serious, and the Fearful, except the Compelled (*Mukrah*). All of them are of the greatest danger, and most frequent occurrence. So the Muslim should beware of them, and fear them for himself. We seek refuge in Allah from the causes of His anger and His painful punishment. And may Allah send blessings upon the best of His creation Muḥammad and upon his family and companions and grant peace.**"

These are the Nullifiers. You find them in some books and [books of] scholars of Najdi Da'wah. And there in the Land of the Two Holy Mosques you find very many explanations there, so knowledge is available there, *alḥamdulillāh*.

I believe I have summarized or tried as much as possible to simplify, although I have prolonged upon you. There are some matters that might slip from me due to time pressure, and some phrases might be here or fall here or there. Notice that it is a lesson relating to an issue of utmost importance and upon which *Kufr* and Faith depend. Therefore we try to present to you a simplification of the creed of the Righteous *Salaf* and the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*, pure and clean from these innovated impurities.

So we ask Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* to benefit with it. And we ask Allah the Great, Lord of the Great Throne, to encompass us in His mercy, and to make our speech purely for His Noble Face. And I ask Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* that you benefit from this course, and that Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* makes it in the scale of our good deeds, us and you.

I say this saying of mine and I seek forgiveness from Allah for me and for you..

Wa al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh..

The Eleventh and Final Lesson

Stating the Madhhab of the Salaf in Faith:

Verily, all praise is due to Allah; we praise Him, we seek His help, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allah from the evils of our souls and our bad deeds. Whomever Allah guides, there is no one to misguide him, and whomever He leads astray, there is no guide for him. I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah, alone with no partner, and that Muḥammad is His slave and Messenger.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ تُقَاتِهِ وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُم مُّسْلِمُونَ

"O you who have believed, fear Allah as He should be feared and do not die except as Muslims." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 102]

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُم مِّن نَّفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا وَبَثَّ مِنْهُمَا رِجَالًا كَثِيرًا وَنِسَاءً ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا

"O mankind, fear your Lord, who created you from one soul and created from it its mate and dispersed from both of them many men and women. And fear Allah, through whom you ask one another, and the wombs. Indeed Allah is ever, over you, an Observer." [QS. An-Nisā’: 1]

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَقُولُوا قَوْلًا سَدِيدًا * يُصْلِحْ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ ۗ وَمَن يُطِعِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيمًا

"O you who have believed, fear Allah and speak words of appropriate justice. He will [then] amend for you your deeds and forgive you your sins. And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has certainly attained a great attainment." [QS. Al-Aḥzāb: 70-71]

To proceed:

The most truthful speech is the Book of Allah, and the best guidance is the guidance of Muḥammad *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. And the worst of matters are their innovations, and every innovation is a heresy (*bid‘ah*), and every heresy is a misguidance, and every misguidance is in the Fire.

Honored brothers, here we are with the twenty-ninth day of the month of Muḥarram for the year 1433 of the blessed Prophetic Hijrah. And we are today, *in shā' Allāh*, concluding this Sharia course titled: *Masā'il fī al-Īmān* (Issues Regarding Faith). This is the **Eleventh and Final Lesson** of this course.

Today, *in shā' Allāh*, we will speak about **Stating the Madhhab of the Salaf in Faith**. We will not speak about other sects, because we discussed them in the ten previous lessons in detail.

So today we will speak only about the summary or quintessence of the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in issues of Faith, and what a Muslim should know and learn regarding these issues.

So in the beginning we speak about the **First Statement**, which is: **Definition of Faith**.

We will speak about the definition of Faith, and also speak about issues related to this definition, and about stating the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* regarding **Does Faith Increase and Decrease?**, and about the **Ruling on the Perpetrator of a Major Sin**, and about **Exception in Faith** (*Istithnā'*), and about other issues related to this subject which is the issue of **Relationship between Faith and Islam**. We also speak about **Levels of Religion** as came in the Hadith of Jibrīl. And we speak about an issue with which we conclude, regarding the issue of **Practical Kufr and Kufr of Belief** and divisions of Major *Kufr*. This, *in shā' Allāh*, we speak about briefly at the end of this lecture, by the permission of Allah the Exalted.

We told you in previous lectures that the *Salaf* define Faith as **Affirmation (*Taṣdīq*) by the heart, Acknowledgment (*Iqrār*) by the tongue, and Action (*'Amal*) by the limbs**. This is what is famous in brief. Although the expressions of the *Salaf* varied. And I read to you the speech of **Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah** when he spoke about the variation of expressions of the *Salaf* in the past in defining Faith. For sometimes they say "**Speech and Action**," and "**Speech, Action, and Intention**," and "**Speech, Action, and Following the Sunnah**," and "**Speech by the tongue, Belief by the heart, and Action by the limbs**."

Then Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah explained it when he said: "Whoever among the *Salaf* said Faith is 'Speech and Action' intended **Speech of the Heart and Tongue** and **Action of the Heart and Limbs**. And whoever added 'Belief' saw that the term 'Speech' might be understood as only Apparent Speech (*Qawl Ẓāhir*), or feared that, so he added Belief by the heart. And whoever said 'Speech, Action, and Intention' said: Speech covers Belief and Speech of the Tongue, but regarding Action, Intention

might not be understood from it [explicitly], so he added that. And whoever added 'Following the Sunnah', it is because all that is not beloved to Allah except by following the Sunnah. And those did not intend *every* speech and action, rather they intended what was legislated of sayings and actions. But their intention was refuting the *Murji'ah* who made it Speech only, so they said: Rather it is Speech and Action."

And those who made it four explained their intent as Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah said: "When **Sahl ibn ‘Abdullāh al-Tustarī** was asked about Faith, what is it? He said: **Speech, Action, Intention, and Sunnah**. Because Faith if it is Speech without Action, it is *Kufr*. If it is Speech and Action without Intention, it is Hypocrisy. And if it is Speech, Action, and Intention without Sunnah, it is Innovation."

These are the expressions of the *Salaf* in this issue regarding the subject of defining Faith and the variation of their expressions regarding that.

And we said a sayer might say: **What is intended by Speech of the Heart?** When we say Speech of the Heart and Action of the Heart, what is intended by that?

Speech of the Heart is its **Affirmation** and its **Knowledge**. And **Action of the Heart**, as we said, is **Hope, Fear, Love, Hatred**; all this is called Action of the Heart. Awe (*Khashyah*), Hope (*Rajā'*), Trembling (*Wajal*), Love (*Ḥubb*), Hatred (*Bughḍ*); all this is called Action of the Heart. As for Speech of the Heart, it is its Affirmation and Knowledge.

Speech of the Tongue is known, it is the **Testimony** (*Shahādah*). He says: (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*). And Speech of the Tongue increases, and applies to Remembrance (*Dhikr*), reciting Qur'an, *Tahlīl*, and *Tasbīḥ*; all this is called Speech of the Tongue.

As for **Action of the Limbs**, it is apparent, and it is **Apparent Actions**. They are Prayer, Fasting, Hajj, Slaughtering, Vowing, Supplication; all this is called Apparent Actions, which are actions of the limbs.

Thus Faith consists of **Apparent** (*Ẓāhir*) and **Hidden** (*Bāṭin*). The Apparent includes Speech of the Tongue and Action of the Limbs. As for the Hidden, it includes Speech of the Heart and Action of the Heart. So the Apparent is Speech of the Tongue and Action of the Limbs, while the Hidden includes Speech of the Heart and Action of the Heart.

Therefore we said and remind as Al-Ḥāfiẓ **Imam Al-Ājurrī** said when he said: "**What the scholars of Muslims are upon is that Faith is obligatory upon all creation, and it is Affirmation by the Heart, Acknowledgment by the Tongue, and Action by the Limbs.**" And he said also: "**Then know that Knowledge by the heart and Affirmation do not suffice unless there is with it Faith by the tongue in speech. Nor do Knowledge by the heart and Speech by the tongue suffice until there is Action by the limbs. So if these three qualities are complete in him, he is a believer.**"

Then we told you that the Imams like Imam Ibn Sallām, Imam Al-Ājurrī, Ibn Mandah, Ibn Abī Shaybah, Imam Qāḍī Abū Ya'lā, and all these inferred from the Qur'an and Sunnah. Imam Al-Ājurrī mentioned fifty-six places in the Holy Qur'an wherein Faith is linked to Actions. And they mentioned many things indicating that Faith is not separated [from action] and that it [action] is a firm pillar of Faith.

And we said also that this is from the statements of the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf*; that **Action is a Pillar of the Pillars of Faith**. And even according to the opinion of one who says Faith is a "Condition of Validity" (*Sharṭ Ṣiḥḥah*), there is no dispute in this [outcome]. Condition of Validity implies that whoever does not perform that is not a believer.

Therefore Imam Al-Ājurrī said, as if challenging those who expel Actions from Faith: "**And know, may Allah have mercy on us and you, that I have perused the Qur'an and found in it what I mentioned in fifty-six places in the Book of Allah *'Azza wa Jalla*: That Allah *Tabāraka wa Ta'ālā* did not admit believers into Paradise by Faith alone, but admitted them into Paradise by His mercy upon them and by what He granted them success to perform of Faith in Him and Righteous Action. This is a refutation of whoever said Faith is Knowledge. And a refutation of whoever said Faith is Knowledge and Speech even if he did not act. We seek refuge in Allah from the sayer of this.**"

Then he cited many verses:

فَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا فَأُعَذِّبُهُمْ عَذَابًا شَدِيدًا فِي الدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ وَمَا لَهُم مِّن نَّاصِرِينَ * وَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ فَيُوَفِّيهِمْ أُجُورَهُمْ ۗ وَاللَّهُ لَا يُحِبُّ الظَّالِمِينَ

"As for those who disbelieved, I will punish them with a severe punishment in this world and the Hereafter, and they will have no

helpers. But as for those who believed and did righteous deeds, He will give them in full their rewards, and Allah does not like the wrongdoers." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 56-57].

And He *‘Azza wa Jalla* said in Sūrah An-Nisā’:

وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ سَنُدْخِلُهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِن تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ۖ لَّهُمْ فِيهَا أَزْوَاجٌ مُّطَهَّرَةٌ ۖ وَنُدْخِلُهُمْ ظِلًّا ظَلِيلًا

"But those who believe and do righteous deeds - We will admit them to gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. For them therein are purified spouses, and We will admit them to deepening shade." [QS. Al-Nisā’: 57].

And very many verses mentioned by Al-Ājurrī and others, and mentioned by Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in detail also in his two books *Al-Īmān al-Kabīr* and *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ* in his refutation of the *Murji'ah* and these sects who expelled Actions from the appellation of Faith.

So this is the basic statement in definition. This is what a student of knowledge and every responsible Muslim should know; that Actions do not separate from the appellation of Faith. And that whoever abandons the **Genus of Action** (*Jins al-‘Amal*), meaning does not pray, does not fast, does not give zakat, as we discussed before, this one is not called a believer. Meaning he says that he said with his tongue (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*) and his heart acknowledged that, but he did not do anything and died upon that; he is not a believer. And according to the definition of scholars of the *Salaf*, he is a disbeliever because the three pillars must be combined. I recount briefly, and we spoke before about these issues.

Among these issues also stated by scholars of the Salaf, and this is from the belief of the *Madhhab* of *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah* in the issue of Faith, is the Ruling on the Perpetrator of a Major Sin:

Regarding scholars of the *Salaf*, they spoke about the ruling of the perpetrator of a major sin and said: **He is a believer by his faith, immoral (*fāsiq*) by his major sin.** And if he dies and does not repent, he is under the Will (*Mashī’ah*). For Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* if He wills, punishes him and puts him in the Fire, but he does not abide eternally in it. And if He wills, He pardons him and does not put him in the Fire and admits him

into Paradise. He deserves punishment and penalty, but is not kept eternally in the Fire, and he is under the Will of Allah the Exalted.

Thus, the ruling of the perpetrator of a major sin according to *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah* in this world is that he is a believer by his faith, immoral by his major sin. And he does not exit from Faith to Disbelief (*Kufr*). Rather they say the owner of a major sin exited from Faith to **Islam**. As for in the Hereafter, he is in the Will of Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* if He wills He punishes him and if He wills He forgives him. This speech was mentioned by Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in the book *Al-Īmān* in the issue of the perpetrator of a major sin.

He moves to the subject of **Islam** regarding general obligations, in attending the funeral, in issues of marriage. The one who commits a major sin, the term Faith is not stripped from him in the general comprehensive sense. However, it is not said about him "Believer" [in the laudatory sense] while we know he is a perpetrator of a major sin. But this description is necessary: We say "Believer by his faith, immoral by his major sin." And we did not strip from him the title of Faith entirely nor the title of Islam or attribute of Islam entirely. This is his ruling in this world.

As for in the Hereafter, he is in the Will of Allah *'Azza wa Jalla* if He wills He punishes him and if He wills He forgives him. If one fornicated or stole and a punishment was established upon him in this world, meaning punishment of stoning or flogging or cutting [hand], if he was punished in this world for his major sin, they said this is expiation for him in this world, so it is repentance for him. The perpetrator of a major sin who did not repent and the *Ḥadd* was not established upon him and did not repent, he is in the Will; if Allah wills He punishes him, and if He wills He pardons him and does not put him in the Fire.

Therefore Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah spoke in these issues and said: "By verifying this station, confusion in this place is removed, intending regarding the ruling of perpetrator of a major sin, and it is known that among Muslims there is a section who is not a pure hypocrite in the lowest depth of the Fire.

Nor is he from the believers about whom it was said: (*The believers are only the ones who have believed in Allah and His Messenger and then doubt not but strive with their properties and their lives in the cause of Allah. It is those who are the truthful.*) [QS. Al-Ḥujurāt: 15]. So he is not this nor that.

Nor from those about whom it was said: (*Those are the believers, truly.*) [QS. Al-Anfāl: 4].

So they are neither hypocrites, nor are they from these truthful believers truly, nor from those who enter Paradise without punishment. Rather he has acts of obedience and acts of disobedience, and good deeds and bad deeds. And he has of faith what prevents eternal abiding in the Fire, and has of major sins what necessitates entering the Fire. And this section might be called by some people: **The Immoral of the Millah (*Al-Fāsiq al-Millī*)**." This is the speech of Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in his book *Al-Īmān al-Awsaṭ*.

And Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah also says in another place regarding the ruling of the perpetrator of a major sin: "Is the name 'Believer' applied to him? There are two opinions in this. The correct view is detailing. If asked about worldly rulings like freeing a slave in expiation, it is said 'He is a believer.' And likewise if asked about his entering into the general address of believers like this. But if asked about his ruling in the Hereafter, it is said: He is not this type of believers promised Paradise. Rather he has faith preventing eternal abiding in the Fire, and he enters Paradise with it after being punished in the Fire if Allah does not forgive his sins. Therefore he said who said: 'He is a believer by his faith, immoral by his major sin'."

So he originally deserves punishment because he has sins, and these sins are not a nullifier of Faith. So in this case he deserves the Fire but does not abide eternally in it. Also these who committed major sins and are among the people of sins for whom the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* intercedes; he might intercede for them. So they are subject to the **Hadith of Intercession**. Because there are people for whom the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* intercedes who deserved entering the Fire; so these might not enter it initially due to intercession, or they exit from the Fire also due to intercession.

So this is regarding the ruling of the perpetrator of a major sin according to us, *Ahl al-Sunnah*. And naturally the evidences are very many. (*And if two factions among the believers fight, then make settlement between the two*) [QS. Al-Ḥujurāt: 9]. And evidence that fighting in itself... that Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* named them brothers: (*So make settlement between your brothers*) [QS. Al-Ḥujurāt: 10]. Had they been disbelievers He would not have said to them: ("Your brothers"). And as Allah the Exalted said: (*Indeed, Allah does not forgive that you should associate partners with Him, but He forgives what is less than that for whom He wills*) [QS. Al-Nisā’: 48].

And we also hold that Faith has **Branches** (*Shu‘ab*). In the Hadith of Branches of Faith for example: ("Faith is seventy-some branches, the

highest is *Lā ilāha illā Allāh* and the lowest is removing harm from the path"). Thus Faith, as Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Qayyim says: "**Faith is branches, and its branches are faith. And Kufr is branches, and its branches are Kufr.**" Meaning Faith is degrees and branches and stations and is called Faith. And Kufr also is branches and stations and branches and is called Kufr also.

But there are branches by whose removal the name of Faith is removed. For example "*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*," the word of Tawhid, is the highest branch of Faith. Whoever fails in this branch is not a believer. As for removing harm from the path or some other branches, even if he did not do it, Faith is not removed from him entirely, although a sin is written against him.

So Faith has many branches; among them is what Faith is removed by its removal, like the *Shahādatayn*, and among them is what Faith is not removed by its removal, like removing harm from the path for example.

And we also said that Faith, as Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Qayyim says according to the majority of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, has multiple branches as in the Hadith. Faith is branches and parts, and Kufr is branches and parts. And there are branches of Kufr that are **Major Kufr** (*Kufr Akbar*) and **Minor Kufr** (*Kufr Aṣghar*). Therefore we have: Kufr is two types of Kufr, Shirk is two types of Shirk, Nifaq (Hypocrisy) is two types of Nifaq, and Fisq (Immorality) is two types of Fisq. Like this in division. Meaning Major Fisq and Minor Fisq, Major Nifaq and Minor Nifaq, Major Shirk and Minor Shirk, and so on.

Therefore according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*, **Faith and Hypocrisy might coexist in a human**; some branches of Faith and a branch of Kufr for example. And this does not expel him from Faith. We say about him: A Muslim having a branch of branches of Hypocrisy. Meaning Faith coexists with Minor Hypocrisy. Naturally I mean here a branch of Minor Hypocrisy, or Minor Fisq, or Minor Shirk. Otherwise, if Major Shirk combined with Faith, or Major Fisq with Faith, or Major Nifaq with Faith, then Faith is removed from him entirely; this is a disbeliever and not a believer. We are speaking about the possibility that Faith and Minor Shirk, and Minor Nifaq, we mean Practical Nifaq naturally, or Minor Fisq coexist in a Muslim servant, not the Major Fisq expelling from the Millah.

So this is what we say regarding the issue that Faith is branches and Kufr is branches. And that these branches vary in their degrees, but the highest branch is (*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*); Faith is removed by its removal. And we told you in the division we made, as scholars said and Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned, that in the era of the Messenger of Allah

people in the Meccan era were two sections; a section Believer outwardly and inwardly, and Polytheist Disbeliever outwardly and inwardly. Then a third section appeared in Medina, and these are the Hypocrites who are Muslims or believers outwardly and disbelievers inwardly.

Then this term evolved as we told you after the generation of Companions and the term "**Zindīq**" appeared, and it is exactly the same meaning in the days of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* in Medina, who are the Hypocrites of Major Hypocrisy. And this term was not known in Medina in the days of the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam*.

The Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* mentioned Hadiths: "The fornicator does not fornicate while he is a believer, nor does the thief steal while he is a believer." Imam Ibn Qutaybah and scholars said: "**This is negation of the Perfection of Faith and does not mean stripping Faith entirely.**" Due to the existence of contextual evidences (*qarā'in*) and things we have discussed before.

And this is among the evidences against those who inferred that "The fornicator does not fornicate while he is a believer" means he is a disbeliever. They said No; "The fornicator does not fornicate while he is a believer" is negation of perfection of Faith. Otherwise, if the fornicator were a disbeliever exiting the Millah, then why is the unmarried flogged [and not killed for apostasy]? If he became an apostate disbeliever exiting Islam, then why these rulings revealed regarding Mā'iz and Al-Ghāmidiyyah and others, and the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* applied them to some Companions at that time?

Thus these [rulings] descended regarding believers who committed major sins, and these major sins were expiation for them by virtue of applying this *Ḥadd*. And proof for that is that the Messenger ordered praying [Janazah] over them. Had they been stripped of Faith entirely, the Messenger of Allah *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* would not have ordered praying over them. Nor would these rulings have been revealed in Sūrah Al-Nūr and in Sūrah Al-Mā'idah about the thief male and female: (*[As for] the thief, the male and the female, amputate their hands in recompense for what they committed as a deterrent [punishment] from Allah*) [QS. Al-Mā'idah: 38]. Otherwise the thief would be killed if he was stripped of Faith [as an apostate], and so on.

There is also another issue from issues of Faith which is: **Does Faith Increase and Decrease?**

We discussed this issue in the statements of the *Salaf*. And we said that Faith increases and decreases; increases with acts of obedience, and decreases with acts of disobedience. This indicates that people are not on one level in Faith nor in Actions; neither in actions of hearts nor actions of limbs. People vary in Faith. And Faith increases without end, and decreases until it reaches final negation from the servant.

We discussed the evidences for that in the statements of the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf*, and discussed it when we refute the *Khawārij* who said Faith does not increase nor decrease. And we refuted also the *Jahmiyyah* who said Faith is a single unit and it is Knowledge and it does not increase nor decrease, how would it increase and how would it decrease while it is a single affirmation!

This issue was a pivot of dispute among Islamic sects entirely. Every sect had an opinion in this. But the *Salaf*, may Allah have mercy on them, after agreeing that Action is a pillar in Faith, saw that people after that are on degrees of variation in Actions, since equality in performing them in the required manner is impossible.

And that is due to variation in people's readiness to accept what reaches them of Sharia obligations. Among them is he who reaches the degree of perfection and can execute legislative commands and avoids all prohibitions, and these are the elite. Among them is he who is foremost in good deeds. Among them is moderate. Among them is negligent. So these are varying degrees. Among people is he who restricts to voluntary acts[29]. And a third accepts legislation and affirms it. And some of them fall short in performing some duties and are lax. And also due to unbridled desire, leading to committing some prohibitions. So people vary in reality too, and it is impossible they are equal in such issues.

Therefore the faith of Abū Bakr and 'Umar *raḍiyallāhu 'anhumā* is more perfect than the faith of others among Companions. Just as the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* is the most perfect of the Ummah in faith, rather the most perfect of humanity entirely. Thus people vary in that. Therefore the *Salaf* looked at this subject. And verses indicate this, like His saying the Exalted:

وَإِذَا مَا أُنزِلَتْ سُورَةٌ فَمِنْهُم مَّن يَقُولُ أَيُّكُمْ زَادَتْهُ هَٰذِهِ إِيمَانًا

"And whenever a surah is revealed, there are among them those who say, 'Which of you has this increased in faith?'" [QS. At-Tawbah: 124]

[29] Likely means obligations + voluntary.

This is a clear evident text. And His saying, *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā*, as in Sūrah Al-Fatḥ:

هُوَ الَّذِي أَنزَلَ السَّكِينَةَ فِي قُلُوبِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ لِيَزْدَادُوا إِيمَانًا مَّعَ إِيمَانِهِمْ

"It is He who sent down tranquility into the hearts of the believers that they would increase in faith along with their [present] faith." [QS. Al-Fatḥ: 4]

So Faith increases.

And He, *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā*, said:

إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الَّذِينَ إِذَا ذُكِرَ اللَّهُ وَجِلَتْ قُلُوبُهُمْ وَإِذَا تُلِيَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتُهُ زَادَتْهُمْ إِيمَانًا

"The believers are only those who, when Allah is mentioned, their hearts become fearful, and when His verses are recited to them, it increases them in faith." [QS. Al-Anfāl: 2]

This is a refutation of the *Murji'ah* and *Jahmiyyah* who do not acknowledge increase of Faith nor its decrease.

And He said:

لِيَسْتَيْقِنَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ وَيَزْدَادَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِيمَانًا

"That the people of the Scripture may reach certainty and those who have believed may increase in faith." [QS. Al-Muddaththir: 31]

And Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* says as in Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān:

الَّذِينَ قَالَ لَهُمُ النَّاسُ إِنَّ النَّاسَ قَدْ جَمَعُوا لَكُمْ فَاخْشَوْهُمْ فَزَادَهُمْ إِيمَانًا

"Those to whom hypocrites said, 'Indeed, the people have gathered against you, so fear them.' But it [merely] increased them in faith." [QS. Āl ‘Imrān: 173]

So these verses are explicit.

And in the Hadith of "**Deficient in Intelligence and Religion**" (*Nāqiṣāt ‘Aql wa Dīn*), which is the Hadith of Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī agreed upon: "That the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* ordered women to give charity and said after that: ('I have not seen any deficient in intelligence and religion more stripping to the mind of a resolute man than

one of you'). They said: 'And what is the deficiency of our intelligence and religion, O Messenger of Allah?' He said: ('Is not the testimony of a woman like half the testimony of a man?') They said: 'Yes, O Messenger of Allah.' He said: ('That is from the deficiency of her intelligence. Is it not that when she menstruates she does not pray nor fast?') They said: 'Yes.' He said: ('That is from the deficiency of her religion')." This indicates that the faith of the man is more perfect than the faith of the woman, since times pass over the woman wherein she does not perform some religious rituals, while the man continues performing them without interruption.

And a woman might be better and greater in religion than hundreds of men. We are speaking generally, the group of men with the group of women.

The witness here is that the Messenger said: ("Deficient in intelligence and religion"). Meaning religion has deficiency (*nuqṣān*). And if religion has no deficiency according to the opinion of *Murji'ah* and *Jahmiyyah* and these, or even according to the opinion of *Khawārij*, then it means she is a disbeliever! So how is this while the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* says there is deficiency in religion?!

The Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* clarified that even people vary. Meaning in the Hadith of 'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: ("There is no Prophet sent by Allah in a nation before me except that he had from his nation disciples and companions taking his Sunnah and following his command. Then successors succeed after them, saying what they do not do, and doing what they are not commanded. So whoever strives against them with his hand is a believer, and whoever strives against them with his tongue is a believer, and whoever strives against them with his heart is a believer, and there is not beyond that of Faith a mustard seed"). This indicates the variation of people, and that Faith increases and decreases, and that people are not on one level in this subject.

So the statement of the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in the issue of Increase and Decrease of Faith is that we believe that Faith increases with obedience and decreases with disobedience. And as Al-Saffārīnī said: *Faith is Speech, Intent, and Action... It is increased by Piety and decreased by slip (sin).*

We come to stating the Madhhab of the Salaf also in the issue of Exception (*Istithnā'*):

We said in stating the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in Exception, "I am a believer, *in shā' Allāh*," in this they have two opinions:

An opinion says it is permissible to say ("I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*") and permissible to leave it. And some say permissible meaning recommended (*mustaḥabb*). And [some] say it is equal to say ("I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*") or leave this issue if you know the one asking you is asking by way of casting doubt. So if the issue is... we say ("I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*") in the sense that this is questioning my belief and faith in Allah and His angels... This is established and no one says ("I testify that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah *in shā' Allāh*"). No one says this. Rather I say it by way of decisiveness and certainty.

Even the *Salaf* when they permitted that, inferred even with the Holy Qur'an coming with the form of exception in a matter definitively decided:

لَتَدْخُلُنَّ الْمَسْجِدَ الْحَرَامَ إِن شَاءَ اللَّهُ آمِنِينَ

"You will surely enter al-Masjid al-Haram, if Allah wills, in safety." [QS. Al-Fatḥ: 27]

Notice Allah is the One saying that. And Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta‘ālā* knew they are entering and that it is decided. Thus Exception is permissible in a decided matter. And this is a refutation of those who forbade Exception.

Whoever wants to review the issue should return to previous lectures so I do not prolong upon you in the issue of detailing other schools in the issue of Exception.

So Exception here... Yes, it is permissible for me to say "I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*," because if I said "I am a believer" like this, it might be understood from it that I performed all commands and avoided all prohibitions, and I am purifying myself as if I testify for myself that I am from the people of Paradise. To miss this upon ourselves, Exception is originally in **Actions**. As for what is in the **Heart**, "I am a believer and it is settled in my heart that I am a believer," the matter is finished.

You will find the *Salaf* frequently doing this. And scholars in the past used to say: ("I am a believer *in shā' Allāh*") by way that he does not purify himself. So it is not understood from him that he is a believer in the sense of **Special Faith** which is that it is a degree higher than Islam, which is the degree from Islam and is the degree of Purification in this case.

We said the highest degree in Levels of Religion is **Iḥsān** (Excellence) as in the Hadith of Jibrīl; they are the Foremost in Good Deeds. As for **Faith** (*Īmān*), it is the Moderate (*Muqtaṣid*). And among

them is **Islam** which comes with the minimum. So these are degrees: *Iḥsān*, then *Īmān*, then Islam.

So this is the summary of the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in this issue. And we told you that the Messenger *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* when he used to go out at the end of the night to Al-Baqī' (graveyard of Al-Baqī') used to say: ("Peace be upon you, abode of believing people. What you were promised has come to you... and we, *in shā' Allāh*, will follow you. O Allah forgive the people of Baqī' al-Gharqad"). Thus in the Hadith he said: ("And we, *in shā' Allāh*, will follow you"). Was the Prophet *ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam* doubting in his death?! Naturally no. Thus Exception is permissible.

So we said their statement in Faith, and said also in stating the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in the issue of perpetrator of a major sin, and said the statement of the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* regarding Faith increasing and decreasing or not, and said the statement of the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* finally in Exception.

There is also another issue which is the **Issue of Kufr**; because an innovation has appeared which is the issue of restricting *Kufr* to **Kufr of Denial** (*Takdhīb*), or to **Heart Lawfulness** (*Istiḥlāl*) only, or that there is no *Kufr* except Belief *Kufr*, while Practical *Kufr* does not exist, rather it is Minor *Kufr* or *Kufr* less than *Kufr*.

We spoke about this issue. But Imam Ibn al-Qayyim divided this division for us as in *Madārij al-Sālikīn* and others, when he divided *Kufr* and said: "**As for Major Kufr, it is five types: Kufr of Denial (*Takdhīb*), Kufr of Arrogance and Refusal with Affirmation (*Istikbār wa Ibā' ma'a al-Taṣdīq*), Kufr of Turning Away (*I'rāḍ*), Kufr of Doubt (*Shakk*), and Kufr of Hypocrisy (*Nifāq*).**

As for Kufr of Denial, it is believing the Messengers are lying. And this section is few among disbelievers." Now we found atheists who deny Messengers and Prophets and everything, even among those born Muslims!

"**As for Kufr of Refusal and Arrogance**, it is the *Kufr* of Iblīs. For he did not deny the command of Allah nor met it with rejection, but received it with refusal and arrogance." Meaning Iblīs disbelieved not because he denied the command of Allah nor rejected it [as untrue], but accepted it with refusal and arrogance.

"From this is the *Kufr* of whoever knew the truthfulness of the Messenger of Allah and that he came with the truth from Allah but did not submit to him out of refusal and arrogance. The predominant *Kufr* of the

enemies of Messengers is that their *Kufr* is *Kufr* of Arrogance and Refusal." Meaning he knows the Messenger is on truth (*And they rejected them, while their inner selves were convinced thereof, out of injustice and haughtiness*) [QS. Al-Naml: 14]. But they were arrogant and refused to submit to this man. "How does this revelation descend on him and he becomes a Messenger while they follow him, when they are masters of people and their leaders and they are kings and they are such and such?" Therefore they disbelieved with *Kufr* of Arrogance and Refusal.

"**As for Kufr of Turning Away**, it is a famous *Kufr* too, which is: To turn away with his hearing and heart from the Messenger; neither affirms him, nor denies him, nor allies with him, nor opposes him, nor listens to what he brought at all." Therefore he says this is ignorant, but ignorant of what? This ignorance is Ignorance of Turning Away; because he does not want to learn originally, so he is truly ignorant. And verses are many in the Qur'an regarding these ignorant ones; because they do not want to learn originally, and he does not want to burden himself to listen to this Prophet. So here he is ignorant but he is the one who turned away from knowledge, he turned away from learning, he turned away from listening.

Therefore the issue of Ignorance intended [in excuse] is the old Sheikh, and at the extinction of time and in the Hadith we spoke about in the Doubts. This is in special cases, that Islam has worn out and its signs ended, and this is what they are capable of regarding knowledge. The utmost they reached of knowledge is this. They know nothing except some issues only and most of religion they do not know. So they are ignorant; therefore they were excused by their ignorance for this reason.

As for the one who has knowledge available, and he turns away from it and does not want to listen and does not burden himself to go as the Companions were... one hears about the Messenger, comes [traveling] some years to the Messenger. Meaning look at seriousness and that he wants to learn. This is unlike the one who was content with sitting and content with what he is in, and does not want to hear nor listen nor anything. This is **Kufr of Turning Away**.

"**As for Kufr of Doubt**, it is: He does not decide firmly on his truthfulness nor his lying but doubts. This one is hesitant, is he truthful or not truthful. This one is a disbeliever by this doubt of his. **As for the other Kufr which is Kufr of Hypocrisy**, it is: To manifest Faith with his tongue while his heart harbors denial." This is the *Kufr* spread now. It was *Kufr* in ‘Abdullāh ibn Ubayy ibn Salūl. And the *Kufr* now rampant in the Islamic world... you find the man says "My name is Muḥammad or ‘Alī or Ḥasan or Ḥusayn," then after that he is a disbeliever in Allah the Great, a knowing

hypocrite in hypocrisy. And this is a *Zindīq* too. He shows us he is Muslim but is among the fiercest enemies of Islam. This is *Kufr* of Hypocrisy too.

These have **Compound Kufr** (*Kufr Murakkab*). Meaning the five types of *Kufr* might enter into this *Kufr*, a collection of *Kufr* in one person. Some people we see in our days, we seek refuge in Allah, you find he has almost committed most types of major sins, or that in all chapters of *Kufr* he has a share. Meaning you do not know from which door he is a disbeliever. Meaning while closing your eyes you know he is a disbeliever by *Kufr* of Turning Away, *Kufr* of Doubt, *Kufr* of Hypocrisy, *Kufr* of Denial, *Kufr* of Arrogance, all of it! And among them are those attributed to Islam or other than Islam.

As for the issue of *Kufr* according to *Ahl al-Sunnah*, we said there is **Practical Kufr** which is **Major Kufr**. And *Kufr* is not restricted to *Kufr* of Denial and Heart only, as they say; because they want to exclude the one who abandons the Genus of Action or these rulers who do not rule by what Allah revealed. Ruling by what Allah revealed is an action; judiciary, legislation, enacting something, this is action. So they want to say this is Minor *Kufr* and that Denial (*Juḥūd*) and Lawfulness (*Istiḥlāl*) are stipulated etc.

Even if a man did not bow a single rak'ah to Allah and died, then in this case this is Practical *Kufr* [according to them], meaning *Kufr* less than *Kufr*, and Minor *Kufr*. So the human is still a believer and the utmost is that he is a perpetrator of a major sin and is under the Will! Meaning for example any tyrant ruler doing all these deeds, they are actions. As long as he said (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*) and acknowledged Faith, then in this case if he permitted prohibitions and killed slaves and worshippers and ruled by other than what Allah revealed, he committed practical *Kufr*. They say: "*Kufr* less than *Kufr*, and it is Minor *Kufr*; because *Kufr* basically is *Kufr* of Belief, Heart Lawfulness only or Denial only." Meaning at least one says to you "I am denying" or "I am making this lawful"!

We say: Not all sins are like this. There are sins mentioned by the Lawgiver like Adultery and Alcohol. One says "Adultery is Halal," "Alcohol is Halal," this is a disbeliever, he made the sin lawful. Or he denies something known from religion by necessity or rejects it and declares it.

In shā' Allāh we might dedicate later issues in **Controls of Takfir** (*Ḍawābiṭ al-Takfīr*) and some words. I mentioned to you in the previous lecture in refuting doubts that scholars in the past cared about words of Takfir as in the book *Qawāṭi' al-Islām* by Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī and I

mentioned to you names of some other books. People cared about these words and placed controls in rulings of Takfir and what is called **Absolute Takfir** (*Takfīr al-Muṭlaq*) and **Takfir of Type** (*Takfīr al-Naw‘*) and **Takfir of Specific Individual** (*Takfīr al-Mu‘ayyan*).

And Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in *Al-Fatāwā* in Volume 28 has good speech in the issue of Takfir of Specific Individual. And there are books that spoke in these issues I mentioned before in refuting these doubts.

But in the end, these require issues of Controls of Takfir, and Impediments of Takfir, and speech on the *Kufr* of the Specific Individual, and *Kufr* of the Sect (*Ṭā’ifah*). These precise details require independent study. We only point general indications.

But we say: Whoever says that **The Abandoner of the Genus of Action is a believer**, this opposes the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf*, and the saying of the Companions, and the scholars of the Ummah, and opposes the Qur'an and Sunnah. Whoever abandons the Genus of Action and suffices with Speech by Tongue and Acknowledgment by Heart is not a believer. And the Companions settled on that.

But the problem came in the generation that came after the Companions, and they differed in the issue of the ruling of the **Abandoner of Prayer**, who leaves prayer out of laziness and leaves it out of denial, or leaves Zakat. But the *Salaf* in the era of Companions, no one of them imagined that one leaves prayer and is a believer. Therefore you will find among scholars those who declare disbeliever the one who leaves prayer whether he left prayer out of laziness or left it intentionally or acknowledged its obligation but did not pray it. They said he is a disbeliever in all cases. And among them are those who detailed. The majority sees that the abandoner of prayer out of laziness differs from the abandoner of prayer intentionally[30], and said this is a disbeliever. And Denial (*Juḥūd*), they did not differ in it, all agree he is a disbeliever.

But the problem is that the generation after the Companions are the ones who differed in the ruling of abandoner of prayer out of laziness or denial. This issue is the only one raised by Imam Aḥmad, and it was said Imam Aḥmad was unique in it. And regarding Shāfi‘īs, Mālikīs, and Ḥanafīs, this majority of schools say abandoner of prayer out of laziness is still Muslim and they did not declare him disbeliever with the *Kufr* expelling from the Millah.

But if we restricted it, Imam Aḥmad and the *Salaf* and before Imam Aḥmad and Imam Al-Awzā‘ī and others and Al-Layth ibn Sa‘d and all

[30] Distinction usually laziness vs denial.

these and before them... all these scholars from the generation of Companions, all these were not differentiating between the one who leaves it out of laziness or denial. And there are no definitive authentic texts indicating that [differentiation].

Whoever wants to expand should return to the book *Ta'ẓīm Qadr al-Ṣalāh* by Imam Al-Marwazī, he has precise details in this subject. Rather among scholars are those who declare Takfir by merely missing Dhuhr prayer or Asr prayer intentionally, one prayer! They consider him needing to testify anew and enter Islam anew. Meaning issues were of utmost danger and precision.

But the problem now is not in the issue of the one who leaves it out of laziness or denial. The problem now is in **The One Who Abandons the Genus of Action Entirely**.

One lived and said (*Ashhadu an Lā ilāha illā Allāh wa anna Muḥammadan Rasūlullāh*), or was born Muslim like this and acknowledges and says "I am Muslim" and finished, and did not bow a single rak'ah to Allah and lived whatever years he lived and in the end died and they say he is a believer! This is the one about whom the *Salaf* said and scholars said that he is not a believer; because he did not come with the Pillar of Action. So he is not a believer even if he said with his tongue and acknowledged with his heart, for the Third Pillar is necessary.

So this is the summary of these statements. These statements are like a quick review for stating the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in issues of Faith. So I hope from whoever wants to understand well not to suffice with this lecture, for this is the last lecture. Listen from the first lecture to this lecture. Meaning listen to the first ten lectures; because they contain details. And I repeat issues a lot and reiterate and add, so the idea settles and knowledge settles with the recipient so the student of knowledge understands what I want. Because we aim from this course that the student of knowledge emerges fortified against people of innovation, and knows the statement of the true *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in these issues.

I conclude this speech with the saying of **Imam Al-Barbahārī** *raḥimahullāhu* in his book *Sharḥ al-Sunnah*: "**If you see a man loving Abū Hurayrah and Anas ibn Mālik and Usayd ibn al-Ḥuḍayr *raḍiyallāhu 'anhum* know that he is a person of Sunnah, *in shā' Allāh*. And if you see a man loving Ayyūb and Ibn 'Awn and Yūnus ibn 'Ubayd and 'Abdullāh ibn Idrīs al-Awdī and Al-Sha'bī and Mālik ibn Mighwal and Yazīd ibn Zuray' and Mu'ādh ibn Mu'ādh and Wahb ibn Jarīr and Ḥammād ibn Salamah and Ḥammād ibn Zayd and Mālik ibn Anas and Al-Awzā'ī and Zā'idah ibn Qudāmah, know that he is a person of**

Sunnah. And if you see a man loving Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, and Al-Ḥajjāj ibn al-Minhāl, and Aḥmad ibn Naṣr, and mentions them with good, and speaks with their speech, know that he is a person of Sunnah." End quote.

Naturally, why did he mention these Companions? Why did he mention **Abū Hurayrah** and **Anas ibn Mālik** and **Usayd ibn al-Ḥuḍayr**? He mentioned these Companions because most people of desires do not love Abū Hurayrah *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu* and attack him as a narrator of the Messenger's Hadith *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* because he was among those who narrated abundantly. He is among the Companions most assaulted historically; attacked in the first era, then in some eras and by people of innovation, and to this time of ours.

You find this even in the book *Qadhā’if al-Ḥaqq* by Sheikh **Al-Ghazālī** when he insinuated and slandered regarding the Hadith ("If a fly falls into the vessel of one of you"), and insinuates even against Abū Hurayrah. Meaning audacity reached, due to them prioritizing their minds, to assaulting this noble Companion! And he is among the fiercest enemies of the *Rāfiḍah* too, after Abū Bakr and ‘Umar and ‘Ā’ishah and ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf and Abū ‘Ubaydah and all these great Companions—*raḍiyallāhu ‘anhum*.

And they hate him due to his care for narrating Hadith and preserving many Hadiths for the Ummah. So they hate him for that. And also they hate Anas ibn Mālik the servant of the Prophet *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam* for beautiful qualities and very strong narrations and his refutation of people of innovation also in his time.

And for the Companion Usayd ibn Ḥuḍayr al-Anṣārī *raḍiyallāhu ‘anhu*, they hate him also because they resent against them the descriptions of the Messenger *ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*. Whoever wishes may return to their virtues to know why they hate them.

And even these scholars mentioned by Imam Al-Barbahārī, died year 329 AH, in his book *Sharḥ al-Sunnah* he mentioned: "**And if you see a man loving Ayyūb and Ibn ‘Awn and Yūnus ibn ‘Ubayd and ‘Abdullāh ibn Idrīs al-Awdī and Al-Sha‘bī and Mālik ibn Mighwal and Yazīd ibn Zuray‘ and Mu‘ādh ibn Mu‘ādh and Wahb ibn Jarīr and Ḥammād ibn Salamah and Ḥammād ibn Zayd and Mālik ibn Anas and Al-Awzā‘ī and Zā’idah ibn Qudāmah, know that he is a person of Sunnah. And if you see a man loving Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal...**", why?

Because Ibn Ayyūb and Ibn ‘Awn and Yūnus ibn ‘Ubayd, all these are the carriers of this religion and narrators of Sunnah and the *Ḥuffāẓ* who

stood up to the people of innovation. They are the scholars of *Jarḥ wa Ta'dīl* (Disparagement and Praise). So he who hates them hates their good deeds; because they preserved the Sunnah, and cared for it with its chains, and exposed these lying fabricating narrators. Therefore they hate them.

And naturally **Imam Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal** has the lion's share of hatred and detestation. They hate him. The *Mu'tazilah* hate him, the *Rāfiḍah* hate him, the *Ash'āriyyah* hate him, and many people of innovation hate him, the *Jahmiyyah* hate him. So the Imam had the large share.

And also Imam **Aḥmad ibn Naṣr al-Khuzā'ī** *raḥimahullāhu* who was killed and his head was hung due to the *Fitnah* of Creation of the Qur'an too, in the days of Caliph Al-Wāthiq al-'Abbāsī. They killed him and tortured him. He was a *Muḥtasib* man, may Allah have mercy on him. He used to undertake Enjoining Good and Forbidding Evil, and object to testing people in the issue of Creation of the Qur'an. Until he was caught and tortured and his head was hung for a long period and his body in Iraq at that time.

Indeed these scholars are the ones who stood before this falsehood and conveyed to us this knowledge and conveyed to us this religion and conveyed to us these writings. And these books which I mentioned to you before are valuable books that should be cared for. I mentioned to you names of some of these books, like *Kitāb al-Īmān* by Imam Ibn Abī Shaybah, *Kitāb al-Īmān* by Abū al-Qāsim 'Ubaydullāh ibn Sallām *raḥimahullāhu*, *Kitāb al-Īmān* also by Qāḍī Abū Ya'lā, *Kitāb al-Ibānah 'an Uṣūl al-Sunnah wa al-Diyānah* by Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Baṭṭah died year 387 AH, and the book of Imam Al-Lālakā'ī which is a great book also in the creed of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, Imam Al-Lālakā'ī died 418 AH.

And *Masā'il al-Īmān* also by Qāḍī Abū Ya'lā died year 458 AH. And *Kitāb al-Īmān* by Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah who supported the Sunnah and restored regard for *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*, and refined the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* and the beautiful wonderful statements undertaken by Shaykhul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah and his school and students too.

The book of Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ also *Al-Shifā'*. And there are also books that spoke on these issues like *Al-Fiṣal* by Ibn Ḥazm although he has some things, but these are widespread books. And the book of Al-Saffārīnī *Lawāmi' al-Anwār*. And the book of Imam Al-Ṭabarī *Al-Tabṣīr fī Ma'ālim al-Dīn*, and he supported in it the belief of *Ahl al-Sunnah*. Imam Al-Ṭabarī's speech is good and his refutations are very strong too.

And books of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, praise be to Allah, are available and existing and now many books have been printed. He who wants to care about books on words of *Kufr* and Faith should care about *Al-I'lām bi Qawāṭi' al-Islām* by Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī died year 973 AH, *Risālah fī Alfāẓ al-Kufr* by Tāj al-Dīn Abū al-Ma'ālī Mas'ūd ibn Aḥmad al-Ḥanafī, *Alfāẓ al-Kufr* by Badr al-Rashīd al-Ḥanafī died year 768 AH, and *Risālah fī Alfāẓ al-Kufr* by Al-Qāsim ibn Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Khānī died year 1009 AH. And naturally we do not forget the books of *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah*, for they are truly pearls (*Durar*).

The easy books now are: *Kitāb Ma'ārij al-Qabūl*, this is a valuable book in its field and good and it simplified very many issues. And the book *Al-'Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* with verifications of scholars and commentators is among the easiest and simplest books, with reservation on some specific issues, and you will find some scholars alerted to these issues mentioned by Ibn Abī al-'Izz al-Ḥanafī.

For mention, the book *Al-'Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* by Imam Ibn Abī al-'Izz al-Ḥanafī, most of his explanation in issues of Names and Attributes and issues of sects and refutations, he took it entirely from Imam Ibn Taymiyyah. Frankly he took most of this speech from the book *Al-Īmān* by Ibn Taymiyyah even if he did not mention him. But if you compared between texts you would find that Ibn Abī al-'Izz al-Ḥanafī's explanation is mostly taken from the words of Imam Ibn Taymiyyah in his book *Al-Īmān* and in his other books too.

And this is good and blessing, praise be to Allah, in this matter. Although there are some subtle points or issues that should have been alerted to. But this is the summary of what we were able to harp on.

With this statement of the *Madhhab* of the *Salaf* in Faith, we have finished, by the grace of Allah the Exalted, this Sharia course. I ask Allah the Great, Lord of the Great Throne, to benefit with it, and make it in the scale of our good deeds on the Day of Resurrection, *in shā' Allāh*.

And perhaps a recipient understands more than a listener. So everyone who listens to this course... especially since the youth know that people of innovation are many and have media mouthpieces and media platforms and have mosques and have those who fund them. So do not belittle anything of good deeds. Spread this course, send it by any means available to you, and spread it to students of knowledge and those who understand, and those in whom you see good marks. So that he listens to it, perhaps Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* opens his heart and expands his breast to understand this religion and returns him to the Truth and he rids himself

of his blind following of his Sheikh or leader or chief or his captivity by a doubt here or there.

So we ask Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* that we be among those who stop at the limits of Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā*, and among those who benefit from this knowledge and act upon it too. For we were focusing on Action, and focusing that Action is a pillar of Faith.

So we ask Allah *Subḥānahu wa Ta'ālā* that we be truthful in what we say, and that Allah forgives us our sins and excess in our affair, and accepts from us and from you.

May Allah reward you with all good, and may Allah bless you for your good listening, and your good patience and toil with us during this course..

And *in shā' Allāh* with another Sharia course..

Wa al-salāmu 'alaykum wa raḥmatullāhi wa barakātuh..

The Course is Completed with the Praise of Allah